National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XVI. NO. 17. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1855. WHOLE NO. 797.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At its Office, 138 *Nassau St., New York*,

AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

31 *North Fifth St., Philadelphia.*

Advertisements inserted at $1 per square for the first insertion, and 25 cents for every subsequent one. For advertisements less than a square, 50 cents for each insertion.

Pro-Slavery.

THE BITTER FRUITS—THE SUICIDE OF SLAVERY.

[From The St. Louis Intelligencer.]

Our news from Western Missouri is of ominous and most discouraging character. That region is suffering from mildew and blight. Its glory is dimmed, its spirits abated and its hopes fading.

The emigration to Kansas has been entirely checked. Emigrants from the Northern or free States have ceased to go to Kansas, because they can find as good lands elsewhere, not cursed by mob law nor ruled by non-resident bullies. Emigrants from the Southern States do not go to Kansas, because they will not put their slave property in peril, by taking it to a Territory where there is a strong Free Soil element, threatening the security of slaves.

Any man of sense might have foreseen the result. Alabama and Georgia may hold public meetings, and resolve to sustain the slaveholders in Missouri in making Kansas a slave State. But their resolutions comprise all their aid—which is not "material" enough for the crisis. When slaveholders of Alabama and Georgia emigrate, they go to Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas. They do not come with their slaves to Missouri or to Kansas. Call they that backing their friends?

Thus the matter stands. The Northern emigrants shun Missouri and Kansas as plague spots of the nation. The Southern emigrants shun Missouri and Kansas, because here is the battle-ground between slavery and Free Soil.

The result is, Kansas, the fairest land under the sun, is neglected and idle; occupied only by a few honest and earnest, but disheartened, pioneers, and lorded over by a dozen or two feudal tyrants of Missouri, who curse by their presence the land they have desolated.

Such is Kansas—poor, neglected and despised—and Western Missouri stands infected by the horrible contagion of outlawry, and dwindles away under the moral leprosy of its mobocratic leaders. We are assured by two gentlemen of high position in Western Missouri, but totally differing in political sentiment—one upholding the oligarchy that controls the affairs and tramples upon the people's sovereignty of Kansas, the other deploring the accursed madness of the day—that matters are gloomy enough in Western Missouri. Business is dull. Commerce is stagnant. Money is exceedingly scarce, and a panic pervades the people. The fifty thousand emigrants that ought this season to have poured over into Kansas are not there. The prairie sod remains unbroken. The sound of the axe and the whoop of the husbandman is not heard. Western Missouri towns are not thronged with settlers buying their outfits and their equipments of husbandry. The farmers find no market for their horses, mules, oxen and cows. There is no new and large trade springing up in Kansas. The much-vaunted Kansas towns lie neglected—a mockery to their owners and a laughing-stock for all men. "Dead—dead—dead" may be written on all the country—so deep and disastrous has been the fall from the high and fond hopes of the past year.

In May last, the editor of the *Intelligencer* was in Kentucky, and he met numerous of the most respectable and wealthy farmers of that State, such as form so large a portion of the population of Missouri, who inquired earnestly about the condition of things in Kansas and in Western Missouri. They spoke of the intention they had of removing to Kansas or Western Missouri, but said they had abandoned it utterly, for the reason that they would never think of taking their families to a region where law was set aside, presses mobbed, and men driven from the country by irresponsible and unknown bands of regulators. They preferred the rule of law to anarchy. In a recent trip through several North-western States, we found that the same circumstances were most industriously and fatally used to divert emigration to those States, and to prejudice Missouri and Kansas with every class of people. The most aggravating stories of insults and outrages committed by Missourians on the persons of emigrants from the Old World or from the free States who are found ascending the Missouri river, are circulated in the newspapers all through the free States; and it is impossible to conceive of the deep hatred thus generated towards our whole State in the Northern half of the Union.

Between these fires Missouri is leading on her languid existence. St. Louis is retarded in a most woeful way. Our railroads creep at snail's pace. We build ten miles while other Western States build one hundred. In every department of life we feel the paralysis. Instead of bounding forward, buoyant, strong and rejoicing, we sit with dull eyes and heavy spirits, and listen to the tick of a deathwatch.

These are the bitter fruits of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise—a wicked and wrongful deed—that will yet bring a hell of bitter self-reproaches to its authors. Missouri did not demand that repeal. The South never asked it. Atchison solicited it—and, in a moment of political insanity, the South consented to the wrong, and made the wrong her own. This was the suicide of slavery.

Every step since taken has deepened the wrong and enhanced the danger. The free States organized Aid Societies, and sent their men to make Kansas free. It had been free soil by solemn compact for thirty-five years, and they naturally were incensed to see its character changed. The South would have been far more indignant if a slave territory had been thus, by an unexpected act of Congress, converted into free soil.

The free States had a right to be indignant that a long-life compromise had been repealed—and they had a right to keep Kansas free as it had been, by peaceful colonization. They attempted nothing else. But a portion of the citizens of Missouri, headed by Atchison and Stringfellow, denounced the Northern emigrants as "paupers and hirelings," because they were sent with the money of a Society; and so they had County meetings in Missouri and raised money, and sent Missourians to Kansas to make Kansas a slave territory! Were these Missourians "hirelings" too? And did these two wrongs make one right?

Atchison and Stringfellow, with their Missouri followers, overwhelmed the settlers in Kansas, brow-beat and bullied them, and took the government from their hands. Missouri votes elected the present body of men, who insult public intelligence and popular rights by styling themselves "the Legislature of Kansas." This body of men are helping themselves to fat speculations by locating the "seat of government" and getting town lots for their votes. They are passing laws disfranchising all the citizens of Kansas who do not believe negro slavery to be a Christian institution and a national blessing. They are proposing to punish with imprisonment the utterance of views inconsistent with their own. And they are trying to perpetuate their preposterous and infernal tyranny, by appointing *for a term of years* creatures of their own, as Commissioners in every County, to lay and collect taxes, and see that the laws they are passing are faithfully executed. Has this age anything to compare with these acts in audacity?

The free State men of Kansas have resolved not to submit to this daring usurpation of a non-resident oligarchy. They have called a Convention of the people of Kansas, to meet in September next, and frame a Constitution for their government. This movement will be supported by thousands in Kansas, and it will rally and bring to their aid the Northern States that have been for the time staggered and confused by the untoward events in Kansas.

The next Congress will find, then, this issue before them—a free State Constitution presented by one portion of the people of Kansas, and the pro-slavery territorial laws of the present fraudulent Legislature. The House of Representatives of the next Congress will be largely Free Soil or Anti-Nebraska. The pro-slavery laws of the *bogus* Legislature will be rejected, and without Congressional sanction they are not valid—and the contest will then be on accepting the Constitution presented by the free State people. This free State Constitution may pass the House, but not the Senate. But the effect will be as disastrous to Missouri and the South. Kansas will be left to anarchy. The slavery that is there will flee from it, and perhaps even the slave property of Western Missouri give way under the panic, and seek safety in the cotton fields and sugar plantations of Texas.

It has been the common opinion with thoughtless persons and thick-headed bullies at the West that Northern and Eastern men will not fight. Never was a greater mistake. The sons of New England and of the middle States do not *like* to fight. They would rather work, plough, build towns, railroads, make money and raise families, than fight. But fight they will, if need be. Remember, the sons of New England shed the first blood in the American Revolution, and they were the last to furl their flags in that terrible struggle. They have never disgraced their country by cowardice, and they will not. They are Americans, with spirit, courage, endurance and deep love of liberty to animate them. The free State men in Kansas will fight before they will be disfranchised and trampled upon. Mark the word.

Here comes, then, the suicide of slavery. The outrages committed by Atchison and his fellows in the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and by Stringfellow and his followers in subjugating Kansas to non-resident rule, will bring on a collision first in Congress and *then in Kansas*—and who shall tell the end?

Slavery will never sustain itself in a border State by the sword. It may conquer in some respects; but it can never "conquer a peace"—never, never! Once light the fires of internecine war in defence of slavery, and it will perish while you defend it. Slaveholders will not stay to meet the fight. Property is timid, and the slaves will be sent to Texas, to be in a "safe State" while the fight lasts; and as soon as the slaves are gone, it will be found that Missouri has nothing to fight about, and the fight will end "before it begins."

Thus the slavery propagandists who repealed the Missouri Compromise to make Kansas a slave State will make Missouri free; and in endeavouring to expel Abolitionism from Kansas, they will find both Kansas and Missouri with an entire free white population—worth more to the two States than all the negroes in America.

Is not the Kansas outrage the suicide of slavery? Have not the people of Missouri, interested in the preservation of slavery in the State, brought themselves into a desperate predicament by following the insane counsels of Atchison and Stringfellow?

Selections.

THE WESTERN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

Condensed from The Bugle.

The Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the Western Anti-Slavery Society was held at Alliance, Stark Co., Ohio, on Saturday and Sunday, Aug. 25th and 26th, in a grove. Dr. Abraham Brooke, President, in the chair. Business Committee, M. R. Robinson, S. S. Foster, Margaret J. Burleigh, A. M. Powell, Jacob Walton, M. F. Morse, Hannah L. Brooke, James Barnaby, Wm. E. Lukens, John M. Holmes.

The meetings were well attended. Those on Sunday were immense. Probably not less than four thousand persons were present; some have estimated the number as far greater. At all events, there was an immense audience of earnest listeners, besides those who came for other purposes. A few representatives were present from adjoining States, and a number from remote Counties of Ohio.

The speaking was plain, practical and powerful. We do not recollect ever to have heard the impracticability and absurdity of the attempt to establish freedom by union with slaveholders made more impressively manifest than by Mr. Foster's irrefutable logic and effective appeals to the consciences of the upholders of this Government. And the effort was not lost. They writhed under it and resisted—felt some doubts of the correctness of their position. And though most or all of them may, as they doubtless will, satisfy their doubts, quiet their consciences, and, in their zeal to do "*something*," thrust in their ballots written over with concessions to the slave masters of fifteen States to continue their infernal oppression, yet the faithful protest against the wrong and the stern demand for uncompromising justice which the Western Anti-Slavery uttered at this Convention will not, cannot be in vain. It cannot, if truth be not powerless to move man's moral nature for the right.

The Convention was favoured with a most happy and impressive address from Miss Mary Grew, of Philadelphia, a faithful friend of the slave. Other speakers also earnestly and ably advocated the principles of the Society. Among them were Mrs. J. Elizabeth Jones, James Barnaby, Aaron M. Powell, Henry C. Wright, and others. The proceedings were enlivened by appropriate music.

The following letter to Passmore Williamson was presented and adopted:

The members of the Western Anti Slavery Society, with other friends of freedom attending its Thirteenth Anniversary, at Alliance, Stark County, Ohio, to Passmore Williamson, in Moyamensing Prison, Philadelphia.

Fellow-worker in the cause of Humanity: Three thousand of us have convened, on this Sabbath day, to labour for the redemption of our oppressed brethren, to strive to drive slavery from our midst, and secure freedom to every inhabitant of the land. From the grove in which we have assembled we would send to you a voice, not of sympathy alone, but of warm approval, of high admiration.

We are aware that you are imprisoned for no violation of law, either human or divine, but simply to gratify the Slave Power, which sought to punish manly honesty and true independence with bolts and bars. Your incarceration has taught, and is teaching, the American people that there is no safety for their own freedom while the Slave Power rules—that while it is in the ascendancy, law will be prostituted to do its bidding, and, in the name of justice, the grossest enormities perpetrated.

It is not often that to any one is presented such an opportunity for a world-wide testimony against judicial wrong as is seen in your case; and we rejoice to believe that you are equal to its demands, and that Judge Kane has found in your consistent firmness an instance of fortitude as unexpected as it is unwelcome.

The press has borne to all parts of the civilized world a record of the particulars which led to your imprisonment; they will be discussed among the more enlightened portions of the European people, as well as among the less intelligent; they are fit subjects of consideration for prince and peasant; they interest both liberal and conservative.

Judge Kane imprisoned you without trial for an alleged attempt of Court. From his decision you have appealed to the great Court of Humanity, to the common instincts of the people. Your appeal has been entertained, and Judge Kane is himself now on trial before the world for contempt of justice, of truth and of right. Sooner or later an impartial verdict will be rendered, which shall be as terrible as was that which caused the power to pass from the hands of Belshazzar. For that verdict, and for that time, you can well afford to wait.

With a belief that yours is a courage not to be daunted by prison bars, a determination that is superior to judicial persecution, we remain your friends and hearty approvers.

On behalf of the assembly aforesaid,

Abraham Brooke, President.

Benj. S. Jones, Secretary.

The Annual Report was read by Marius R. Robinson, Corresponding Secretary. It speaks in an encouraging tone of the state of the cause in the Society's field of labour, although, owing to the financial embarrassments which have existed at the West during the past year, the receipts from subscribers and donors have been less than usual, compelling the Executive Committee, very reluctantly, to curtail their lecturing operations. The *Bugle*, though conducted with great ability, and regarded as the Society's principal "staff of accomplishment," is far from self-sustaining. The hope is indulged that the bounteous harvest of the present season, by relieving many friends of the cause from pecuniary embarrassment, will ensure large contributions to the treasury for the coming year and more prompt payment from subscribers. The labours of C. C. Burleigh, Wm. Wells Brown, Joseph S. and Josephine Griffing, Leonard Griffing, A. T. Foss and James Barnaby, not only in Ohio, but in Indiana and Michigan, during the past year, are said to have been productive of widely beneficial results. The Tract enterprise of the Parent Society is warmly commended. We are encouraged, say the Committee, to find among some of the Abolitionists of the West a suitable appreciation of this work. One lady, about to travel to Wisconsin, sends for a large supply, expressing a desire, if possible, "to leave one in every door-yard she should pass on her route." A Justice of the Peace writes that "for the last time he has sworn to a lie" (alluding to his oath to support a pro-slavery Constitution), and, wishing to make some amends for his past support of slavery, he sends money to pre-pay the postage on *twelve pounds* of tracts, for circulation among those who had elected him to office. Let others imitate these and similar examples, and let Abolitionists burden the mail to *circulate their tracts by the pound*. It will be more profitable to the "Department," and far more advantageous to the morals and freedom of the country, than to load them with the franked, pro-slavery electioneering matter with which demagogues and office-seekers crowd them. The Committee look with great hope to the extended usefulness of this department during the coming year, and earnestly entreat the vigorous cooperation of all Abolitionists. The position of the church and of the political parties is fearlessly exhibited, and the friends of liberty are entreated not to waste their efforts on partial issues and half-way measures, but to strike at once for the abolition of slavery on every inch of the American soil.

The officers of the Society were chosen as follows:

President—Abraham Brooke.

Vice-Presidents—Benjamin Bowne, Emily Robinson, Geo. Garretson, W. F. Parker, Christian Donaldson, A. M. Clement, Jacob Walton, Sarah Otis Ernst, Wm. Watson, Lot Holmes, Lydia Irish, Marsena Miller, Marcus F. Morse.

Recording Secretary—Benjamin S. Jones.

Corresponding Secretary—Marius R. Robinson.

Treasurer—Joel McMillan.

Counsellors—Lewis Morgan, Esther Harris, John Gordon, Isaac Trescott, Josephine S. Griffing, Sarah Bowne, James Barnaby.

The following resolutions were adopted:

Resolved, That, in assembling again to consider our relation with the oppressed, and our responsibilities arising therefrom, we desire to place ourselves as nearly as may be in the slave's stead, to see with his vision and to feel with his instincts, that we may be enabled to perceive clearly and to expose faithfully all those various and insidious influences with which a hateful and oppressive oligarchy has surrounded our people, compelling them, either knowingly or unwittingly, to subserve its tyrannical purpose.

Resolved, That the Anti-Slavery movement comprises more than opposition to the Nebraska bill, the repeal of the Fugitive Slave law, the restoration of the Missouri Compromise, the refusal to admit new slave States into the Union, or the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia; it contemplates the annihilation of the principles of chattelism, the remodelling of that public sentiment which now acts itself out indifferently through pro-slavery laws, or without such laws, and which can only be effectually reached by an appeal to the moral principle in man's character.

Whereas, the system of American slavery is a system of remorseless cruelty, unmitigated injustice to the slave, debasing and demoralizing to the master, corrupting and dishonourable to the nation, and unblushingly defiant of all the laws of the Governor of the Universe; therefore,

Resolved, That immediate repentance and unconditional emancipation is the duty of the master, of the nation, of the church, and of all associations and individuals who in any way contribute to fasten his bonds.

Whereas, our National Confederacy was originally formed by a concession to slaveholders of their monstrous claim to hold and treat human beings as chattels; therefore,

Resolved, That it was wicked and infamous in its original organization.

And whereas, more than sixty years of experience in this Union has proved its worthlessness to protect the personal liberties of those already free, and only adapted to perpetuate and extend slavery; therefore,

Resolved, That it is the *right* and the duty of each and every non-slaveholding State to secede from the present Union, and form a Confederacy on the principle of "No Union with Slaveholders."

Resolved, That each man who forms or enters into an alliance with slaveholders, on the principle that the majority shall rule, and the minority submit to and help execute the will of the majority, and that the same rights, privileges and protection be extended to slaveholders that are extended to non slaveholders, must be, by virtue of his position in such a Union, an enemy to justice and liberty, and must be held responsible for the consequences, should the Government be directed to the support of slaveholding, slave-catching and slave-trading.

Resolved, That as our only hope of abolishing slavery, and of securing the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, is in the dissolution of the present Union and the formation of a Confederacy based on the principles of impartial liberty, therefore we will do what we can to get the States in which we live to take initiatory steps for the formation of such a Government.

Resolved, That in behalf of outraged liberty, and in the protection of our own natural and civil rights, deeply imperrilled by the atrocious conduct of Judge Kane, of the United States Court, we demand of the House of Representatives his impeachment for his unparalleled tyranny in the imprisonment of Passmore Williamson.

Resolved, That the only safe and consistent position for our Northern churches is one of entire and unqualified disfellowship of slaveholders, both in politics and religion, and of uncompromising opposition to the Federal Government, an admitted bulwark of slavery, a Government which, in the name of Justice and Liberty, and under the forms of law, sanctions and perpetuates upon three millions of our countrymen every conceivable crime.

Whereas, the issue tendered by the Republican party, of "No Slavery outside the Slave States," connected with its repeated declarations, in its platforms and by its leaders, that slavery *has* a rightful political existence in the States, is an abandonment of moral power and principle in efforts for its removal, and the repetition of a vain and oft-tried effort to make peace and effect a compromise between irreconcilable antagonisms; therefore,

Resolved, That we cannot consent to waste our energies or compromise our principles by voting with that party, however estimable may be its candidates and however desirable a union of all opponents of slavery extension.

NEW YORK CONGREGATIONALISTS ON SLAVERY.

The General (Congregational) Association of New York, at its recent meeting in Spencerport, Monroe County, adopted the following resolutions:

Whereas, the encroachments of slavery for the last thirty years have been such as greatly to embolden the enemies of freedom and prepare them for any nefarious plot and any violent measures for its execution;

And whereas, the recent unlawful proceedings in Kansas on the part of Missouri slavery-propagandists are an outrage upon our republican principles, never before known or possible in this country;

And whereas, it is alleged that other plots are now forming for making more slave States by purchases from the Choctaw and other Indian tribes, and by a contemplated cession of the Platte country from the State of Missouri to the Territory of Kansas;

And whereas, Ministers of the Gospel in Missouri, who have refused to enter into any complicity with the system of slavery, but have silently borne their testimony against that system as a hindrance to the Gospel, have been brought into peril of their persons and their lives, and been ignominiously driven from the State, and ministers in other States of the South have, for the same cause, been threatened with the violence of a mob;

And whereas, such measures strike a blow at that freedom of religion and that security of the individual citizen which are guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States to all its citizens in all the States and Territories of the Union, and also contravene the fundamental rights and duties of the disciples of Christ everywhere; therefore,

Resolved, That the General Association of the State of New York deeply deplore this state of things as tending to subvert our free government and to erect in its stead a despotism of the most fearful kind—that of a *Slave Oligarchy*.

Resolved, That we call upon the clergy, in the spirit of their ministerial fathers of the Revolution, to preach upon this subject with a view both to enlighten their people and to awaken a proper interest and concern for our common country.

Resolved, That *all the lovers* of freedom and of the institutions springing therefrom be hereby urged, in the present crisis, to be wakeful to their birth-right blessings and to be prepared and prompt to resist the measures now about to be perfected for the final subjection to eternal slavery of an immense territory once forever consecrated to freedom!

A long report was presented, from a Committee (Rev. J. P. Thompson, Chairman), appointed last year, "to investigate and report in regard to the course pursued by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, the American Missionary Association, the American Home Missionary Society, the American Tract Society, and the American Sunday School Union on the subject of Slavery." The report was unanimously adopted. It declares, strangely enough, that the action of the American Board at Hartford, last year, "has placed it in a position on the subject of slavery that should satisfy every reasonable mind." The American Missionary Association is unqualifiedly commended. Of the Home Missionary Society it speaks as follows:

"The principal point at which this Society comes in contact with the system of slavery is through certain churches which admit slaveholders to their fellowship, whose pastors are in part sustained by funds from the Society. This contact is less direct than is that of the American Board through its Choctaw Missions; for the American Home Missionary Society has not even that virtual control over the churches it assists which the Board has over its mission churches. The relation of this Society to a church it aids is in no case ecclesiastical, but pecuniary and to a certain extent moral. *It assists the church to support its pastor.* True, the Society makes an evangelical faith and discipline—as in the case of churches composed of foreigners—a condition of its aid; and so it might make the exclusion of slaveholders such a condition. But this would be to determine upon abstract grounds, that it is impossible for one who sustains the legal relation of a slaveholder to be a Christian, for surely no *Christian* should be shut out from church-fellowship. Your Committee are not prepared to demand this of any such Society."

The Committee then proceed to *recommend*, as regards the Home Missionary Society, the principle expressed in the following resolution, adopted some years since, by the Albany Congregational Convention:

"Resolved, That, in the opinion of this Convention, it is the tendency of the Gospel, wherever it is preached in its purity, to correct all social evils, and to destroy sin in all its forms; and that it is the duty of Missionary Societies tolerant and to churches in slaveholding States in the support of such ministers only as shall so preach the Gospel and inculcate the principles and application of Gospel discipline, that, with the blessing of God, it shall have its full effect in awakening and enlightening the moral sense in regard to slavery, and in bringing to pass the utter abolition of that stupendous wrong; and that, wherever a minister is not permitted to preach, he should, in accordance with the directions of Christ in such cases, depart out of that city!"

The Committee add:

"In the spirit of the foregoing resolution the missionaries of the Home Missionary Society in Missouri, Rev. Messrs. Starr and Reeve, have recently left their fields of labour in that State, because they could no longer maintain their position of non-complicity with slavery, without peril to their lives. *Few* churches remain as beneficiaries of the Home Missionary Society which have any complicity with slavery; and since the incidental connection of that Society with slavery arises wholly from the coöperation of the (N. S.) Presbyterian Church therewith—for no Congregational churches assisted by the Society have any connection with slavery—the manifest drifting of that church toward separate ecclesiastical action in Home Missions *may eventually relieve the Home Missionary Society of all embarrassment upon the subject of slavery.*"

Notwithstanding the manifest desire, apparent in this language, to whitewash the Society, the Committee are forced to admit that it is brought into complicity with slavery through the Presbyterian Church. The plea so naively interposed, that "*few* churches remain as beneficiaries of the Society which have any complicity with slavery," reminds us of the appeal for charity so pathetically urged by one who became a mother before she was a wife: "It was such a *little* one!" The only hope that the Society "may eventually" be brought into right relations with slavery is based upon the anticipation that the Presbyterians will withdraw therefrom!

The Tract Society and the Sunday School Union are arraigned and condemned for their pro-slavery shortcomings and sins. The action of the former is reviewed at considerable length. After presenting the facts in the case, which we have often published, the report proceeds:

"It is only with reference to slavery *in the United States* that the Society holds its peace. This studious avoidance of the subject, where alone the candid discussion of it can be of any moment, is a sad evidence of that fatal spell which the great dragon of the South has cast over many good men in the land. Most humiliating, too, is the defence of its policy which the officers of the Tract Society have lately issued. Several churches, associations, religious journals and private individuals, members of the Society and contributors to its funds, having remonstrated with the Executive Committee upon their policy on the subject of slavery, the Committee have at length issued a document by way of vindication, entitled 'Principles and Facts of the American Tract Society.' This reply is a beautiful specimen of typography, embellished with a very pretty picture of the Tract House. But the document itself is a most remarkable illustration of the timid policy of the Committee upon the subject of slavery. It ignores the very question at issue. Only by the most remote allusion does it recognise any dissatisfaction with the course of the Committee upon slavery—a system which it does not so much as name in a tract of 16 pages. That allusion is in the following terms: 'This Society was formed by Christians of various denominations, to publish the great evangelical truths in which they are agreed. It is thus precluded from publications involving subjects of controversy among evangelical Christians. Nor can topics of a local or sectional character be expected in the issues of a national Catholic institution.'

"It occurs to your Committee, in this connection, to suggest that the crime of polygamy will soon become 'a topic of a local or sectional character,' through the political relations of the Mormon community of the United States. On the principle of this Catholic basis, as interpreted by this statement, the Society could not publish a tract upon the sanctity of marriage.

"The remainder of this document treats entirely of the material interests of the Tract Society, of its mechanical arrangements, its evangelical character, and its general work; repeating the common places of every annual report, of every sermon by Secretary or agent, and of almost every number of the *American Messenger*.

"Good men, men of standing in the church and in society, whole churches and associations, the religious press, all ask of the Society: *Why do you not, in some of your many thousand publications, condemn that systematic wrong which defrauds the labourer of his hire?*

"The Committee answer—'The Tract-House, at 150 Nassau street, is eighty feet by ninety-four, and five stories high, besides basement for storing paper, and cellar for coal.' (p. 1.)

"The inquirers ask, *Why do you not, in some of your many thousand publications, maintain the sanctity of the marriage institution, and condemn that system which forcibly separates husband and wife, which encourages concubinage and licentiousness, and which makes the most sacred of all unions a mere commercial expedient for increasing marketable stock?*

"The Committee answer—'The machinery of the Tract-House is propelled, and the entire building is also heated, by steam. The central court is excavated and forms a boiler-room.' (p. 1.)

"The inquirers ask, *Why do you not, in some of your fifty thousand daily issues, apply the Gospel to the stupendous wrong of holding in bondage three millions of people upon the soil of this free Christian country?*

"The Committee answer—'The *American Messenger* has obtained a circulation of more than two hundred thousand copies. The Society has issued publications in 117 languages and dialects. Dr. Duff said he had attempted to analyze the Society's list of publications, but found them so varied as to excite his wonder and admiration.' (pp. 9, 10 and 21.)

"The inquirers ask, *Why do you not, in some of your varied publications, enforce the duty of teaching all men to read, of giving to all men the Bible; and condemn the crime of keeping from any the light of God's word?*

"The Committee answer—'The Society employs 619 colporters and publishes more than 200,000 copies of the *Family Christian Almanac*.' (p. 9.)

"The inquirers ask, *Why do you not, in some of your thousand publications, condemn the traffic in human flesh, and show that 'men-stealers' as well as 'drunkards' and 'covetous persons' are shut out from the kingdom of God?*

"The Committee answer—'The following is the form of a bequest to the American Tract Society.' (p. 16.)

"We have not caricatured the document issued from the Tract-House as a virtual reply to the inquiries and remonstrances of thousands of the friends of the Society, as to its policy on the subject of slavery. It is humiliating to find that the Committee of a great institution for spreading the Gospel of Christ have neither the courage to apply the Gospel to the system of slavery nor the magnanimity to give a reason for their silence. Such an answer as is given in this pamphlet to the respectful inquiries of thousands of the supporters of the Society, however well meant, is little less than an insult to the understanding of the Christian public."

The report deprecates any effort to "cripple the resources of an institution which, through the benefactions of the Christian public, has obtained a position of wealth and independence equal to that of the largest publishing houses." It also discountenances all "divisive movements," and proposes to redeem the Society by the following process:

"The members of the Society must labour directly with its Executive Committee and its Secretaries. There is no reason why an officer of any benevolent society, however valuable his services, or however estimable his character, should have a life lease of his office, or should be continued in that office for form's sake, when he is unwilling to conform the policy of the institution to the known wishes of the great body of his constituents. Every *life-member* of the American Tract Society—made such by the payment of twenty dollars—is entitled to vote in the election of its directors. Every *life-director* is entitled to vote in the Board of Directors at the election of Secretaries and the Executive Committee. Let, then, the members of the Society, severally or in companies, address to each member of the Publishing Committee, and to the Secretaries, the simple inquiry: *Are you in favour of bringing the influence of the American Tract Society, through its ordinary publications, to bear against the system of American Slavery, as sinful and hostile to the Gospel of Christ?*

"If this question shall be answered in the affirmative, the course of the Society in future will be plain. If in the negative, on the part of any or all the members of the Committee or of the Secretaries, let there be, at the annual election of the Board of Directors, a *vote* equivalent to a vote in the British Parliament of "*want of confidence*" in the existing ministry. Whenever the constituents of the Society shall make it apparent to its officers that they intend to apply the principle of the responsibility of representatives to the management of that Institution, the policy of the Society upon the subject of slavery will be made to conform to an enlightened Christian sentiment."

While the subject was before the Association, the Rev. Leonard Bacon, D.D., of New Haven, made a speech, which *The Independent* reports as follows:

"He was one of the *elected* Directors of the Tract Society, and, as such, had an invitation to the last annual meeting; but the arrangements were such that all the business of electing Directors and an Executive Committee was crowded into the hour immediately preceding the anniversary addresses.

"The whole arrangement of this election he pronounced a mere sham, unworthy of a body of Christians united in attempts to do good. But whenever the givers shall rise and appoint a new committee, it will be found that the present Managers will not give way, but will insist that the Tract-House, of which so much is said, was built with *New York* money, and is owned in New York, and that people in the country have no right to do anything but *give their funds*. The only fair, honest way of securing an election by actual members of the Society is, to keep a ballot-box open all day, and check every voter on the list; *but the Society have no wish to do this*, nor to submit to the counsels of those who sustain it.

"The Society do *not* publish *only* that which is held in common by all who are united in it. *Sheer cowardice*, nothing else, keeps them from publishing on slavery. They are ready to publish against dancing and against smoking, for from this they have nothing to fear. Those who dance and smoke will not *fight* those who do not, or who condemn these practices. He asked if John the Baptist might not have died of old age if he had had the Committee of the Tract Society to give him advice? If the Tract Society were sitting as a coroner's jury over his headless trunk, they would have to bring in a verdict of *felo de se*. The *moral sense* of Christian men at the South may be right, but they are afraid to have the Society speak the truth. It is Atchison, and Stringfellow, and the devil and his angels, that make them fear; and their timidity constrains the Society to keep silence. And whenever the Society are brought to publish a tract on the subject of slavery, even if it be a few pages from Simmons's Scriptural Manual, the pure and simple language of the Bible alone, and put it in circulation, every colporteur, every agent in all the South, will be molested and driven out, so that, as far as those States are concerned, this whole system will come to a stand still. The inauguration of a new policy would unquestionably *arrest* the action of the Society. But, after long and careful thought on the subject, he was convinced that the present policy debauches the conscience of the North and of the South, and had come to have the decided opinion that if there were no connection of Christian bodies at the North and South, Christianity would exert twice the power at the South that it now does. If there were a Southern publication society at Charleston, making a selection and buying only what they choose at the North, they would begin soon to exert the influence of Christianity against slavery. Now they feel that they are "act for the defence," not of the Gospel, but of slavery. Let the responsibility rest on themselves—on the Christians of the South; let there be a little more Congregationalism, a little more mutual independence, and we should see a different result. Let the Christians of Virginia say what is right and what is wrong for themselves; and then, if they choose to sell themselves to do iniquity, let them do it, but let us be free. The attempt to make a church or denomination "*national*" impairs the influence of Christianity and the Gospel in respect to crime at the South. It is not known generally that the best and strongest churches in the South—in Georgia, *e.g.*—which do most for the poor and enslaved, which show most of conscience, are *independent Congregational churches*. Let us be thankful that we have no responsibility for them. If we were confederated with them, we should be continually making them worse, and they would be making us worse. And if the Committee of the Tract Society were released from the temptation to suit the *conardice* (not the *conscience*) of the South, there would at once be freedom of action."

SLAVERY AND ANTI-SLAVERY.

To the Editor of The [London] Inquirer.

Sir: The occasional good word you are accustomed to speak on the removal of our slave system in the United States induces me, as an American, to offer an article on that subject for your columns.

I am a native and resident of one of the Northern States, and have long and carefully studied the evil of slavery; its consequences to the cause of freedom, humanity and religion, everywhere; and also what are the most hopeful means for its overthrow. The remedy for the evil is not so easily reached as many suppose. Slavery is a State and not a National institution; and so Congress has no power to interfere against it. The Federal Constitution provides for its protection, but not for its removal, and so Congress may enact Fugitive Slave laws, and provide other securities in support of the system, but there its power ceases. And besides, the slaveholders have always an equal vote with the North in the Senate, the Upper House in our national parliament. The Constitution provides that each State shall have two Senators, and no more; the Northern States have a free population almost double that of the Slave States; and yet they are limited in the Senate, and of course everywhere in the Government, to the same power; the States, North and South, being always about equal in number. Then, on every question affecting slavery, the South will be unanimous; and besides, can buy or bully any number of Northern votes that may be required in the Lower House to achieve its objects. The result of all this need not be told; in every political contest against slavery, the South is victorious.

And this has made the anti-slavery enterprise what it most emphatically is, *a moral and religious movement*. Nor is it strange, while so large a proportion of the Church and Ministry of the country not only defend, but *do the deeds of slavery*, and while so very few have washed their hands clean of the guilt and sin, that the anti-slavery cause should be in open controversy with such a Religion. The Church is arraigned, not only for conniving at crime, but committing it. So that a higher, purer morality must be proclaimed and practised, a truer, holier religion must prevail, before the nation can be rescued from this fearful evil. But our Church and nation abound in anti-slavery professions. Doubtless many persons do seriously hate slavery, who yet, by their position, lend all their influence to sustain it. What really makes an Abolitionist is a serious question. Let me, Mr. Editor, show *what is not one*.

When, in 1820, Missouri came into the Union as a slave State, the North rose indignantly against such extension of the evil. But it was done, and the North slept again. When Texas was dismembered from Mexico and annexed to the Southern States, the thunders of Northern opposition were once more awakened. Petitions and protests, resolves and remonstrances, flew in tempests from Maine to Mississippi. But, as before, the South triumphed, and soon the Northern skies were clear again. The enactment of the Fugitive Slave law, in 1850, again roused us as never before. The Union shook to its foundation. A mandate so monstrous had never been seen by human eyeballs. Before it the decrees of Nero paled almost into justice, and the bloody statutes of Draco into righteousness. And the voice of Northern prayer and protestation against it swelled away to heaven like the noise of many waters. But the bill become a law. Mrs. Stowe's wondrous book appeared soon after, and was read by millions. More tears were wept over the imaginary death of "Uncle Tom" than over Washington and all the Presidents who have died since. But the people pledged their next Presidential candidate most sacredly to execute the Fugitive law, at all hazard, at all cost. Then they elected him by a much larger vote than the country ever gave before. Such, so far, was Northern opposition to the Fugitive Slave law.

The demand for the Nebraska bill was resisted by the North almost unto blood. In 1820, it was decreed that slavery should never be extended North beyond 36° 30′. The Nebraska bill repealed that restriction, and opened new territory enough to the ravages of the destroyer to be carved into two or three great empires. But again is Northern resistance fast declining; and slavery hastens to another triumph in the seizure of Cuba, and large conquests in Central America.

Such has ever been Northern opposition to slavery, so far as any large body of the people is concerned. But are such men Abolitionists? Will slavery ever be abolished in this way? Would the holy cause of Freedom be safe in such hands? Will any say that such somnambulists, who only wake to see the outrage done and then sleep sounder than before—will any say these are the men to whom to commit the most solemn trusts? Never was there a more fatal mistake than to suppose a few impulsive, convulsive strivings against some new aggression are any surety or sign even that those who thus strive are Abolitionists, or indeed opposed to slavery.

At a late meeting of Unitarian ministers, in Liverpool, the mistake under consideration was most apparent. I was on the Continent at the time, and so could not immediately invite attention to it. But it was that meeting which has induced this article. It seemed a pity to me that so large, so worthy and so anti-slavery a body as that really was should be misled on so vital a question. A resolution was offered which led to some panegyric upon Dr. Gannett, of Boston. The Rev. Philip Carpenter, of Warrington, expressed his regrets that Dr. Gannett's course on the subject of slavery had not always been such as became a successor of the late venerated Channing. This well-merited remark was received, says the *Christian Reformer*, with "murmurs of dissent."

But why murmurs of dissent? It was Dr. Gannett who declared publicly that, should a fugitive slave ask bread and shelter at his door, he would turn him away; and that the Fugitive law must be executed! Dr. Gannett was the minister of the Commissioner who volunteered his services to the slave-hunter when the poor slave Sims was seized in Boston, and hurled back to bondage worse than death, and he boldly defended the act of his parishioner. The reason given for the dissenting murmurs was, that Dr. Gannett had repented of his former course, had preached against slavery, and was becoming an Abolitionist. Even Rev. Mr. Channing, recently of the United States, came to the defence, and bestowed upon the Doctor the highest encomiums. And he did this, he declared, as an American, and "as an Abolitionist of the Abolitionists" in that country. And as such, he said, he "hoped his testimony would be received by his friend Carpenter."

But just about that time the New England Abolitionists held their great annual Convention in Boston. There the course and character of Dr. Gannett as a public influential man were investigated. But weighed in the balances of truth and justice he was found wanting. His opposition to slavery was seen to be exactly like that I have described. It was called forth by new demands of slavery upon the North. No righteous rebu

and with every year the nation has been plunging deeper and still deeper in this great moral whirlpool. Let the nation think of God's justice and tremble. No nation ever persisted in a wicked and corrupt course and was blessed with length of days. All history attests this truth. The sword may slumber in its scabbard for a while, but it will finally be awakened and execute the direst vengeance.

THE WHEELER SLAVE CASE.

DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA—WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS REFUSED.

THE Supreme Court met on Saturday, Sept. 8th, at noon, for the purpose of rendering the decision of the Court on the application of Passmore Williamson for a writ of habeas corpus. The five Judges were upon the Bench, and the District Court-room, in which the Court sat, was crowded with attentive listeners. Judge Black read the decision of the Court. It is as follows:

EX-PARTE WILLIAMSON—OPINION BY JUSTICE BLACK.

This is an application by Passmore Williamson for habeas corpus. He complains that he is held in custody under a commitment of the District Court of the United States for a contempt of that Court in refusing to obey its process. The process which he is confined for disobeying was a habeas corpus commanding him to produce the bodies of certain coloured persons claimed as slaves under the law of Virginia.

Is he entitled to the writ he has asked for? In considering what answer we shall give to this question, we are, of course, expected to be influenced, as in other cases, by the law and the Constitution alone. The gentlemen who appeared as counsel for the petitioner, and who argued the motion in a way which did them great honour, pressed upon us no considerations except those which were founded upon their *legal* views of the subject.

It is argued, with much earnestness, and, no doubt, with perfect sincerity, that we are bound to allow the writ, without stopping to consider whether the petitioner has or has not laid before us any probable cause for supposing that he is illegally detained—that every man confined in prison, except for treason or felony, is entitled to it *ex debito justitiæ*—and that we cannot refuse it without a frightful violation of the petitioner's rights, no matter how plainly it may appear on his own showing that he is held in custody for a just cause. If this be true, the case of ~~ex parte~~ Lawrence (5 Binn. 304) is no law. There the writ was refused because the applicant had been previously heard before another Court. But if every man who applies for a habeas corpus must have it, as a matter of right, and without regard to anything but the mere fact that he demands it, then a Court or a Judge has no more power to refuse a second than a first application.

Is it really true that the special application, which must be made for every writ of habeas corpus, and the examination of the commitment, which we are bound to make before it can issue, are mere hollow and unsubstantial forms? Can it be possible that the law and the Courts are so completely under the control of their natural enemies, that every class of offenders against the Union and the State, except traitors and felons, may be brought before us as often as they please, though we know beforehand, by their own admissions, that we cannot help but remand them immediately? If these questions must be answered in the affirmative, then we are compelled, against our will and contrary to our convictions of duty, to wage a constant warfare against the Federal tribunals by firing off writs of habeas corpus upon them all the time. The punitive justice of the State would suffer still more seriously. The half of the Western Penitentiary would be before us at Philadelphia, and a similar proportion from Cherry Hill and Moyamensing would attend our sittings at Pittsburg. To remand them would do very little good; for a new set of writs would bring them all back again. A sentence to solitary confinement would be a sentence that the convict should travel for a limited time up and down the State, in company with the officers who might have him in charge. By the same means the inmates of the lunatic asylums might be temporarily enlarged, much to their own detriment; and every soldier or seaman in the service of the country could compel his commander to bring him before the Court six times a week.

But the habeas corpus act has never received such a construction. It is a writ of right and may not be refused to one who shows a *prima facie* case entitling him to be discharged or bailed. But he has no right to demand it who admits that he is in legal custody for an offence not bailable; and he does make what is equivalent to such an admission when his own application and the commitment referred to in it show that he is lawfully detained. A complaint must be made and the cause of detainer submitted to a Judge before the writ can go. The very object and purpose of this is to prevent it from being trifled with by those who manifestly have no right to be set at liberty. It is like a writ of error in a criminal case, which the Court or Judge is bound to allow if there be reason to suppose that an error has been committed, and equally bound to refuse it if it be clear that the judgment must be affirmed.

We are not aware that any application to this Court for a writ of habeas corpus has ever been successful, where the Judges, at the time of the allowance, were satisfied that the prisoner must be remanded. The petitioner's counsel say there is but one reported case in which it was refused (5 Binn. 304); and this is urged in the argument as a reason for supposing that in all other cases the writ was issued without examination. But no such inference can fairly be drawn from the scarcity of judicial decisions upon a point like this. We do not expect to find in reports so recent as ours those long-established rules of law which the student learns from his elementary books, and which are constantly acted upon without being disputed.

The habeas corpus is a common law writ, and has been used in England from time immemorial, just as it is now. The statute of 31 Char. II., c. 2, made no alteration in the practice of the Courts in granting these writs (3 Barn. and Ald. 420 to Chitty's Reps. 207). It merely provided that the Judges in vacation should have the power which the Courts had previously exercised in term time (1, Chitty's Gen. Prac., 686), and inflicted penalties upon those who should defeat its operation. The common law upon this subject was brought to America by the colonists; and most, if not all, of the States have since enacted laws resembling the English statute of Charles II. in every principal feature. The Constitution of the United States declares that "the privilege of a writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended unless when, in cases of rebellion or invasion, the public safety may require it." Congress has conferred upon the Federal Judges the power to issue such writs according to the principles and rules regulating it in other Courts. Seeing that the same general principles of common law on this subject prevail in England and America, and seeing also the similarity of their statutory regulations in both countries, the decisions of the English Judges, as well as of the American courts, both State and Federal, are entitled to our fullest respect as settling and defining our powers and duties.

Blackstone (3 Com. 132) says the writ of habeas corpus should be allowed only when the Court or Judge is satisfied that the party hath probable cause to be delivered. He gives cogent reasons why it should not be allowed in any other case, and cites, with unqualified approbation, the precedents set by Sir Edward Coke and Chief Justice Vaughan in cases where they had refused it. Chitty lays down the rule (1 Cr. Law, 101; General Prac. 686–7). It seems to have been acted upon by all the Judges. The writ was refused in Rex vs. Scheiner (1 Burr, 765), and in the case of the three Spanish sailors (2 Black's R., 1,324). In Hobhouse's case (3 Barn. & Ald., 420), it was fully settled by a unanimous Court, as the true construction of the statute, that the writ is never to be allowed if, upon view of the commitment, it be manifest that the prisoner must be remanded. In New York, when the statute in force there was precisely like ours (so far, I mean, as this question is concerned), it was decided by the Supreme Court (5 Johns., 282), that the allowance of the writ was a matter within the discretion of the Court, depending on the grounds laid in the application. It was refused in Huster's case (1, 2, C. 136), and in Exparte Ferguson (9 Johns. R., 139). In addition to this, we have the opinion of Chief Justice Marshall in Watkins's case (3 Peters, 202), that the writ ought not to be awarded if the Court is satisfied that the prisoner must be remanded. It was accordingly refused by the Supreme Court of the United States in that case, as it had been before in Kearney's case.

On the whole, we are thoroughly satisfied that our duty requires us to view and examine the cause of detainer now, and to make an end of the business at once, if it appear that we have no power to discharge him on the return of the writ.

This prisoner, as already said, is confined on a sentence of the District Court of the United States for a contempt. A habeas corpus is not a writ of error. It cannot bring a case before us in such a manner that we can exercise any kind of appellate jurisdiction in it. On a habeas corpus, the judgment, even of a subordinate State Court, cannot be disregarded, reversed or set aside, however clearly we may perceive it to be erroneous, and however plain it may be that we ought to reverse it if it were before us on appeal or writ of error. We can only look at the record to see whether a judgment exists, and have no power to say whether it is right or wrong. It is conclusively presumed to be right until it is regularly brought up for revision. We decided this three years ago, at Sunbury, in a case which we all thought one of much hardship. But the rule is so familiar, so universally acknowledged, and so reasonable in itself, that it requires only to be stated. It applies with still greater force, or at least for stronger reasons, to the decisions of the Federal Courts. Over them we have no control at all, under any circumstances, or by any process that could be devised. Those tribunals belong to a different judicial system from ours. They administer a different code of laws, and are responsible to a different sovereignty. The District Court of the United States is as independent of us as we are of it—as independent as the Supreme Court of the United States is of either. What the law and the Constitution have forbidden us to do directly on writ of error, we, of course, cannot do indirectly by habeas corpus.

But the petitioner's counsel have put his case on the ground that the whole proceeding against him in the District Court was *coram non judice*, null and void. It is certainly true that a void judgment may be regarded as no judgment at all; and every judgment is void which clearly appears on its own face to have been pronounced by a Court having no jurisdiction or authority in the subject matter. For instance, if a Federal Court should convict and sentence a citizen for libel, or if a State Court, having no jurisdiction except in civil pleas, should try an indictment for a crime and convict the party, in these cases the judgments would be wholly void. If the petitioner can bring himself within this principle, then there is no judgment against him; he is wrongfully imprisoned, and we must order him to be brought out and discharged.

What is he detained for? The answer is easy and simple. The commitment shows that he was tried, found guilty and sentenced for *contempt of Court*, and nothing else. He is now confined *in execution of that sentence*, and for no other cause. This was a distinct and substantive offence against the authority and Government of the United States. Does anybody doubt the jurisdiction of the District Court to punish contempt? Certainly not. All Courts have this power, and must necessarily have it; otherwise they could not protect themselves from insult or enforce obedience to their process. Without it they would be utterly powerless. The authority to deal with an offender of this class belongs exclusively to the Court in which the offence is committed, and no other Court, not even the highest, can interfere with its exercise, either by writ of error, mandamus or habeas corpus. If the power be abused, there is no remedy but impeachment.

The law was so held by this Court in M'Laughlin's case (5 W. & S. 275), and by the Supreme Court of the United States in Kearney's case (7 Wharton, 38). It was solemnly settled as part of the common law, in Brass Crossley's Case (3 Wilson, 183), by a Court in which sat two of the foremost jurists that England ever produced. We have not the smallest doubt that it is the law; and we must administer it as we find it. The only attempt ever made to disregard it was by a New York Judge (4 Johns. R., 345), who was not supported by his brethren. This attempt was followed by all the evil and confusion which Blackstone and Kent and Story declared to be its necessary consequences. Whoever will trace that singular controversy to its termination will see that the Chancellor and the majority of the Supreme Court, though once outvoted in the Senate, were never answered.

The Senate itself yielded to the force of the truths which the Supreme Court had laid down so clearly, and the judgment of the Court of Errors in Yate's case (4 Johns. 593) was overruled by the same Court, the year afterward, in Yates agt. Lansing (9 Johns. R. 403), which grew out of the very same transaction, and depended on the same principles. Still further reflection, at a later period, induced the Senate to join the popular branch of the Legislature in passing a statute which effectually prevents one Judge from interfering by habeas corpus with the judgment of another on a question of contempt.

These principles being settled, it follows irresistibly that the District Court of the United States had power and jurisdiction to decide what acts constitute a contempt against it; to determine whether the petitioner had been guilty of contempt; and to inflict upon him the punishment which, in his opinion, he ought to suffer. If we fully believed the petitioner to be innocent—if we were sure that the Court which convicted him misunderstood the facts or misapplied the law—still we could not reëxamine the evidence or rejudge the justice of the case, without grossly disregarding what we know to be the law of the land. The Judge of the District Court decided the question on his own constitutional responsibility. Even if he could be shown to have acted tyrannically or corruptly, he could be called to answer for it only in the Senate of the United States.

But the counsel for the petitioner go behind the proceeding in which he was convicted, and argue that the sentence for contempt is void, because the Court had no jurisdiction of a certain other matter which it was investigating, or attempting to investigate, when the contempt was committed. We find a judgment against him in one case, and he complains about another, in which there is no judgment. He is suffering for an offence against the United States; and he says he is innocent of any wrong to a particular individual. He is conclusively adjudged guilty of contempt; and he tells us that the Court had no jurisdiction to restore Mr. Wheeler's slaves.

It must be remembered that contempt of Court is a specific criminal offence. It is punished sometimes by indictment, and sometimes in a summary proceeding, as it was in this case. In either mode of trial the adjudication against the offender is a conviction, and the commitment in consequence is execution (7 Wheat. 38). This is well settled, and, I believe, has never been doubted. Certainly the learned counsel for the petitioner have not denied it. The contempt may be connected with some particular cause, or it may consist in misbehaviour which has a tendency to obstruct the administration of justice generally. When it is committed in a pending cause, the proceeding to punish it is a proceeding by itself. It is not entitled in the cause pending, but on the criminal side (Wall. 134).

The record of a conviction for contempt is as distinct from the matter under investigation, when it was committed, as an indictment for perjury is from the cause in which the false oath was taken. Can a person convicted of perjury ask us to deliver him from the Penitentiary on showing that the oath on which the perjury is assigned was taken in a cause of which the Court had no jurisdiction? Would any Judge in the Commonwealth listen to such a reason for treating the sentence as void? If, instead of swearing falsely, he refuses to be sworn at all, and he is convicted not of perjury, but of contempt, the same rule applies, and with a force precisely equal. If it be really true that no contempt can be committed against a Court while it is inquiring into matter beyond its jurisdiction, and if the fact was so in this case, then the petitioner had a good defence, and he ought to have made it on his trial. To make it after conviction is too late. To make it here is to produce it before the wrong tribunal.

Every judgment MUST be conclusive until reversed. Such is the character, nature and essence of all judgments. If it be not conclusive, it is not a judgment. A Court must either have power to settle a given question finally and forever, so as to preclude all further inquiry upon it, or else it has no power to make any decision at all. To say that a Court may determine a matter, and that another Court may regard the matter afterward as open and undetermined, is an absurdity in terms.

It is most especially necessary that convictions for contempt in our Court should be final, conclusive and free from reëxamination by other Courts on habeas corpus. If the law were not so, our judicial system would break to pieces in a month. Courts totally unconnected with each other would be coming in constant collision. The inferior Courts would revise all the decisions of the Judges placed over and above them. A party unwilling to be tried in this Court need only defy our authority, and, if we commit him, take out his habeas corpus before an Associate Judge of his own choosing; and if that Judge is of opinion that we ought not to try him, there is an end of the case.

The doctrine is so plainly against the reason of the thing that it would be wonderful, indeed, if any authority for it could be found in the books, except the overruled decision of Mr. Justice Spencer, of New York, already referred to, and some efforts of the same kind to control the other Courts, made by Sir Edward Coke, in the King's Bench, which are now universally admitted to have been illegal, as well as rude and intemperate. On the other hand, we have all the English Judges, and all our own, disclaiming their power to interfere with, or control, one another in this way. I will content myself by simply referring to some of the books in which it is established that the conviction of contempt is a separate proceeding, and is conclusive of every fact which might have been urged on the trial for contempt, and among others want of jurisdiction to try the cause in which the contempt was committed. 4 Johns. R., 325, et seqq. The opinion of Ch. J. Kent, on pages 370 to 375. 6 Johns. 503. 9 Johns., 423. 1 Hill, 170. 5 Iredell, 190. Ib., 153. 9 Sandt., 724. 1 Carter, 160. 1 Blackf., 166. 25 Miss., 836. 2 Wheeler's Criminal Cases, p. 1. 14 Ad. and Ellis, 556. These cases will speak for themselves, but I may remark as to the last one that the very same objection was made there and here. The party was convicted of contempt in not obeying a decree. He claimed his discharge on habeas corpus because the Chancellor had no jurisdiction to make the decree, being interested in the cause himself. But the Court of Queen's Bench held that if that was a defence, it should have been made on the trial for contempt, and the conviction was conclusive. We cannot choose but hold the same rule here. Any other would be a violation of the law which is established and sustained by all authority and all reason.

But certainly the want of jurisdiction alleged in this case would not even have been a defence on the trial. The proposition that a Court is powerless to punish for disorderly conduct, or disobedience of its process in a case which it ought ultimately to dismiss for want of jurisdiction, is not only unsupported by judicial authority, but we think it is new even as an argument at the bar. We ourselves have heard many cases through and through before we became convinced that it was our duty to remit the parties to another tribunal. But we never thought that our process could be defied in such cases more than in others.

There are some proceedings in which the want of jurisdiction would be seen at the first blush; but there are others in which the Court must inquire into all the facts before it can possibly know whether it has jurisdiction or not. Any one who obstructs or baffles a judicial investigation for that purpose is unquestionably guilty of a crime for which he may and ought to be tried, convicted and punished. Suppose a local action to be brought in the wrong county; this is a defence to the action, but a defence which must be made out like any other. While it is pending, neither a party, nor an officer, nor any other person, can safely insult the Court or resist its order. The Court may not have power to decide upon the merits of the case; but it has undoubtedly power to try whether the wrong was done within its jurisdiction or not. Suppose Mr. Williamson to be called before the Circuit Court of the United States as a witness in a trial for murder, alleged to be committed on the high seas. Can he refuse to be sworn, and, at his trial for contempt, justify himself on the ground that the murder was committed within the limits of a State, and thereby triable only in a State Court? If he can, he can justify perjury for the same reason. But such a defence for either crime has never been heard of since the beginning of the world. Much less can it be shown, after conviction, as a ground for declaring the sentence void.

The wish which the petitioner is convicted of disobeying was legal on its face. It enjoined upon him a simple duty, which he ought to have understood and performed without hesitation. That he did not do so is a fact conclusively established by the adjudication which the Court made upon it. I say the wish was legal, because the act of Congress gives to all the Courts of the United States the power "to issue writs of habeas corpus when necessary for the exercise of their jurisdiction, and agreeable to the principles and usages of law." Chief Justice Marshall decided, in Burr's trial, that the principles and usages referred to in this act were those of the common law. A part of the jurisdiction of the District Court consists in restoring fugitive slaves; and the habeas corpus may be used in aid of it when necessary. It was awarded here upon the application of a person who complained that his slaves were detained from him. Unless they were fugitive slaves, they could not be slaves at all, according to the petitioner's own doctrine; and if the Judge took that view of the subject, he was bound to award the writ. If the persons mentioned on it had turned out on the hearing to be fugitives from labour, the duty of the District Judge to restore them, or his power to bring them before him on a habeas corpus, would have been disputed by none except the very few who think that the constitution and law on that subject ought not to be obeyed. The duty of the Court to inquire into the facts on which its jurisdiction depends is as plain as its duty not to exceed it when it is ascertained. But Mr. Williamson stopped the investigation *in limine*; and the consequence is, that everything in the case remains unsettled, whether the persons named in the writ were slaves or free.

Whether Mr. Wheeler was the owner of them—whether they were unlawfully taken from him—whether the Court had jurisdiction to restore them—all these points are left open for want of a proper return. It is not our business to say how they ought to be decided; but we doubt not that the learned and upright magistrate who presides in the District Court would have decided them as rightly as any Judge in all the country. Mr. Williamson had no right to arrest the inquiry because he supposed that an error would be committed on the question of jurisdiction, or any other question. If the assertions which his counsel now make on the law and the facts be correct, he prevented an adjudication in favour of his protégés, and thus did them a wrong, which is probably a greater offence in his own eyes than anything he could do against Mr. Wheeler's rights. There is no reason to believe that any trouble whatever would have come out of the case if he had made a true, full and special return of all the facts; for then the rights of all parties, black and white, could have been settled, or the matter dismissed for want of jurisdiction, if the law so required.

It is argued that the Court had no jurisdiction, because it was not averred that the slaves were fugitives, but merely that they owed service by the laws of Virginia. Conceding, for the argument's sake, that this was the only ground on which the Court could have interfered—conceding that it is not substantially alleged in the petition of Mr. Wheeler—the proceedings were, nevertheless, not void for that reason.

The Federal tribunals, though Courts of limited jurisdiction, are not *inferior* Courts. Their judgments, until reversed by the proper appellate Court, are valid and conclusive upon the parties, though the jurisdiction be not alleged in the pleadings nor any part of the record (10 Wheaton, 192). Even if this were not settled and clear law, it would still be certain that the fact on which jurisdiction depends need not be stated *in the process*. The want of such a statement in the body of the habeas corpus, or in the petition on which it was awarded, did not give Mr. Williamson a right to treat it with contempt. If it did, then the Courts of the United States must get out the ground of their jurisdiction in every subpœna for a witness, into a defective and untrue averment will authorize the witness to be as contumacious as he sees fit.

But all that was said in the argument about the petition, the writ and the facts which were proved or could be proved, refers to the *evidence* on which the conviction took place. This has passed *in rem judicatam*. We cannot go one step behind the conviction itself. We could not reverse it if there had been no evidence at all. We have no more authority in law to come between the prisoner and the Court, to free him from a sentence like this, than we would have to countermand an order issued by the Commander-in-Chief to the United States Army.

We have no authority, jurisdiction or power to decide anything here except the simple fact that the District Court had power to punish for contempt a person who disobeys its process—that the petitioner is convicted of such contempt—and that the conviction is conclusive upon us. The jurisdiction of the Court on the case which had been before it and everything else which preceded the conviction are out of our reach, and they are not examinable by us—and, of course, not now intended to be decided.

There may be cases in which we ought to check usurpation of power by the Federal Courts. If one of them would presume, upon any pretence whatever, to take out of our hands a prisoner convicted of contempt in this Court, we would resist it by all proper and legal means. What we would not permit them to do against us we will not do against them.

We must maintain the rights of the State and its Courts, for to them alone can the people look for a competent administration of their domestic concerns; but we will do nothing to impair the constitutional vigour of the General Government, which is "the sheet anchor of our peace at home and our safety abroad."

Some complaint was made in the argument about the sentence being for an indefinite time. If this were erroneous, it would not avail here; since we have as little power to revise the judgment for that reason as for any other. But it is not illegal nor contrary to the usual rule in such cases. It means commitment until the party shall make proper submission (3 Lord Raymond, 1,108. 4 Johns., R. 375).

The law will not bargain with anybody to let its Courts be defied for a specific term of imprisonment. There are many persons who would gladly purchase the honours of martyrdom in a popular cause at almost any given price, while others are deterred by a mere show of punishment. Each is detained until he finds himself willing to conform.

This is merciful to the submissive and not too severe upon the refractory. The petitioner, therefore, carries the key of his prison in his own pocket. He can come out when he will by making terms with the Court that sent him there. But if he choose to struggle for a triumph—if nothing will content him but a clean victory or a clean defeat—he cannot expect us to aid him. Our duties are of a widely different kind. They consist in discouraging, as much as in us lies, all such contests with the legal authorities of the country. *The writ of habeas corpus is refused.*

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1855.

THE HALF MORE THAN THE WHOLE.

PEOPLE are as slow to see how much more the Half is than the Whole now as they were in Hesiod's time. They think it a paradox, whereas it is a simple verity. It is this blindness of mind, added to a chronic hardness of heart, that makes the North so afraid of Disunion. It cannot see that this Half of the country would be much stronger, safer, richer, happier, more honourable, more honoured, without the other, than the Whole is now. Therefore it is slow to receive the wholesome counsel which would advise it to cleave the Union in twain—to throw away the worser part and live the purer with the other half. And not only the purer, but the more profitably, the more creditably, the more peaceably—that it would put money in its purse and keep it there, and enable it to hold up its head in the company of the Nations as one that was fit for respectable Powers to associate with on equal terms. All this would a Dissolution of the Union do. What is the Union? Is it an Order of Things dictated by God and Nature? Is the Constitution of the United States a Charter coming straight from the Chancery of Heaven, with the signet of divinity set upon it? Is it even hallowed by the authority of a vast antiquity, whose very clouds and darkness give it prescriptive awe and right supremacy? None of these things. The men are hardly dead that contrived the partnership. Not a few yet survive who actually helped to establish it. It is no palladium fallen down from Heaven, like "the sacred shields of Rome," but an act of partnership for the benefit of all concerned, with nothing more holy in its character than attaches to any mutual arrangement for the sale of dry-goods, shoes or pork, and no more to be retained after it has failed of its ends than any of the co-partnerships in Wall Street or State Street.

And there is no real difference of opinion on this point among men of sense and business. How many of the Union-Savers of Castle Garden or Faneuil Hall do you suppose would have pledged themselves to eternal loyalty to the Union could it have been demonstrated to them that their business would have been doubled and their incomes trebled by knocking it in pieces? It was precisely because the Union represented the material prosperity they worshipped that they were filled with zeal in its behalf, and were swift to offer up human sacrifices in Broadway and State Street to its godhead. It was as a means to the ends they loved that they loved it. Let it be shown that business will be helped and profits swelled by Disloyalty to the Union and the Constitution, and it will soon be at a premium in the stock-markets of all the great Northern Cities. Now, we believe that the time is fast coming, if it be not at the door, when the value of the Union will be weighed in the scales of the Market-place and calculated on the principles of the Exchange. Men will learn, or will be compelled to see, that the Union, instead of being a means of peace and prosperity, is unfailingly and necessarily the source of continual derangement and disturbance in public and private affairs. What a country like ours wants is tranquillity and quiet. It grows best not in storm, but in sunshine. But what enduring prosperity can there be in a country where the governing power is the natural enemy of the producing power? Prosperity there may be, but it is in spite of the institutions which obstruct it. If the country has advanced so fast and so far with a dead body fastened to it by three millions of fetters, what would it not have done had it been but free and unshackled? Had our fathers, in 1789, had but the wisdom and the nerve to strangle the young serpent that haunted the cradle of the nation committed to their nursing, instead of leaving it to grow up

> "——— larger than whom the sun
> Ingendered in the Pythian vale on slime,
> Huge Python,"

to devour their children, what an astonishment of greatness we should have been to the world!

Unity and homogeneity are essential to the existence of a really great empire. There can be no permanency in institutions where the few govern the many, and govern them by virtue of the very institutions created by the many themselves; and still less when the element of sectionality is mixed up with those of hostility of interests. Had the oligarchs of old France, or the landed aristocracy of England, had seats in Gascony or in Hampshire, and thence issued their edicts, they would have been pulled down long ago. But when the governing oligarchy has fixed boundaries outside of the strength and wealth of the country, and where the many have it in their power, at any time, to put things to rights, the day of revolution cannot be very long put off. When people are pretty well off, they naturally shrink from change. Revolutions are not good for trade, in the first instance, unquestionably. But, then, Revolutions are not made with a slate and pencil. They spring from passions and principles. And passions were never more awake and principles were never better understood than they are at this moment. Both the North and the South are deeply agitated, and with passions and principles as diametrically opposed to each other as light and darkness. How is it possible that mines and countermines like these, running deep under the very foundations of the country, should not explode at last? How can two walk together except they be agreed? And how is it possible that these two should ever be so agreed again?

But, then, for the comfort of the political economists, the men who have no faith in any virtue that does not help to put the balance of Profit and Loss on the right side of the account, they may be assured that the change which will make this nation two will make this half of it much stronger, much more honoured and much richer than while it had to bolster up its scandalous partner. And why should it not? We have been struggling for sixty years against legislation aimed at our prosperity by our natural enemies, changing its policy, from time to time, from War to Peace, from Bank to No Bank, from Protection to Free Trade, but all equally meant to cripple and hinder the Industry of the North. To be sure, the innate energy of the Yankee in pursuit of the Dollar has enabled us to prosper in spite of all this hostile legislation, and perhaps we are now beyond its power to hurt. But should we be any worse off if we had the control of the laws which affect our interests in our own hands? It would be pleasant, if it were merely for the curiosity of the thing, to have some line of public policy tried that was not designed to cut our throats. Nor is it strictly true that we are beyond the reach of malignant legislation on the part of the Slaveholders. How narrowly have we escaped a War with Spain? And who will insure us against one within two years, if the Democratic party prevail at the next Presidential Election, and if England and France be still engaged with Russia? We have had to fight the Florida and the Mexican Wars for the South, and we did not mind it much, as it helped to keep the Tariff high and did not immediately and offensively touch our pockets. But a Spanish War would be a different affair, and would expose the richest booty ever offered to the buccaneers of all countries (our own included), in our commerce afloat. We do not affirm that a Dissolution of this Union will take place to-day or to-morrow. But we do say that if the North is not ready to meet this question when it comes fairly up, as it will as soon as next winter, and to accept Dissolution as a better thing than the present disgraceful state of affairs, then it must make up its mind to be the serf of the Slaveholders for an indefinite time to come. The Dissolution must soon come, or the Union be even less worth having than it has always been.

It is only a question of time, how long the Union is to last. Separation, unless Slavery be first abolished, is as inevitable as Death itself. The insolences and aggressions of Slavery have been increasing in an arithmetical ratio from year to year, and now they are hurrying on at a rate which Geometry itself cannot measure. It is hardly conceivable that a time will not come when kicks will have virtue enough to drive a little spirit into the stupid, sluggish North. The longer it is put off, the more difficult and complicated it will be. It should have been done in 1815, when the Hartford Convention smothered it; it would have saved us from a world of disgrace had it been insisted on in 1820, when Missouri came in over our heads; it was imperatively demanded in 1845, at the time of the larceny of Texas; and it has been an instant duty, knocking at our doors ever since. It is human nature, and American nature especially, to put off evil days and to compromise duties away for conveniences; but it really seems as if the endurance even of the North was nearly out. It has always been an Issachar, a strong ass, couching beneath its burdens; but there is reason to hope that the burdens have been so heaped on that even its assinity will make a stand. It must either throw them off or be a galled jade forever. But we do not believe this can be. The Revolution which is to unseat the Slaveholders from our necks is as sure to come as the one that is to rid the nations of Europe of the riders that have come into the world booted and spurred to bestride their necks. And it will be easier, and must come sooner. The people must learn to look this necessity in the face; and the longer they look at it, the less terrible will it appear. After separation, we shall, by the natural laws of political economy, have all the good we now have from the South, and be rid of all the burdensome and dishonourable impositions and tasks involved in the Union. We shall be as many, as strong and as rich, and we shall not have to fight the wars, to keep down the slaves, and to pay the bills, postage bills and all, of the South. Our moral and political support will be withdrawn from Slavery, and our moral power over the masters multiplied ten-fold. There will be no Southern party then; no doughfaces in Congress or in the pulpits; no State Judiciary, like that of Pennsylvania, purchasing the favour of the Slave Oligarchy by a base surrender of its prerogatives. Such vermin as the Kanes and Griers will have been *squelched*. The moral and religious power of the nation will be arrayed against Slavery as it has never yet been. And the physical power, if its interposition were ever demanded, will certainly not be on the side of the masters. The slaves will at least have a fair chance if they should take them by the throats and demand their own rights. Yes, the Half will be more, much more, then, than the Whole is now.

"JUDGMENT TURNED AWAY BACKWARD."

He looked for judgment, but behold oppression; for righteousness, but behold a cry.—*Isaiah V: 7.*

ON Saturday last, the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania promulgated its decision on the application of Passmore Williamson for a writ of *habeas corpus*. The prayer of the incarcerated petitioner was denied. The Opinion of the Court was read by Judge Black, and was concurred in by Judges Lewis, Woodward and Lowrie. Judge Knox earnestly and emphatically dissented. The Opinion of the majority will be found in our present issue; that of Judge Knox we are reluctantly compelled to postpone till next week.

Wherever the spirit of Liberty and respect for the dearest rights of our children has not been destroyed by the insidious and morally poisonous influences of slavery, this most remarkable decision will excite alarm and indignation. It is a deliberate attempt, by the Supreme Judges of a Free State—a State, too, that has boasted of its Democracy—to strike down the right of *habeas corpus*; that right so dear to a free people, so important to their liberties, and which has so long been the boast and the pride of England and of these United States. And not only have they cloven down this right, as far as they can do it, and sustained Judge Kane in his illegal and tyrannical conduct toward Passmore Williamson; they have even disrobed themselves of the dignity of the judicial bench, in order to impugn the motives and insult the feelings of the prisoner whom they have in their power, and whose lofty tone of character, and manly, honourable course of conduct, they seem utterly incapable of appreciating. It is, perhaps, not strange that men who, in their capacity of grave Judges, can coolly trample the plainest law under their feet, to subserve purposes best known to themselves, should also stultify and disgrace themselves by such utterances as the closing paragraphs of this decision. They inform Passmore Williamson that he "carries the key of his prison in his own pocket"; that he "can come out when he will, by making terms with the Court that sent him there." Ay, can he, indeed? So could John Huss have quenched the flames through which his martyr soul went up to heaven, by "making terms" with the Court which doomed him to that fiery trial of his faith. So has every sufferer for right and truth, stern old Covenanter and patient Quaker, in days gone by, carried the key of his prison cell in his own pocket. He had but to recant. One word, said Luther, would have changed my enemies into friends, would have satisfied the Diet, would have sent me away loaded with honours instead of reproaches. That one word was *peccavi*. So mocks the inquisitor his tortured victim, by proffering him deliverance and prosperity and eternal blessedness on one simple condition, viz., that he shall deny his faith, and acknowledge allegiance to the Church which holds him in her powerful grasp. Men on the judicial bench, or in the editorial chair, may sneer at and ridicule, because they cannot understand, the heroism which suffers imprisonment and death for the sake of a *principle*; yet such heroism is a reality, and is still extant in the world. That men, high in office, in both Church and State, have so little comprehension and appreciation of it, is a lamentable indication of the moral corruption of the times.

If anything beyond Judge Kane's despotic conduct, in the name of the Federal Government, were needed to arouse the citizens of Pennsylvania to a full consciousness of the danger which it is in from the growing arrogance of the Slave Power, this insolent attempt to deprive them of that cherished defence of their liberties, the *habeas corpus*, will, surely, be sufficient to this end. It cannot be that the people will submit to such outrages in the name of law. Should they do so, the next "responsibility" which our Judges will assume will, probably, be the abolition of the Jury Trial.

A portion of the Philadelphia press has faithfully rebuked this outrage, and warned the people of the disastrous end to which these things tend. The pusillanimity and wickedness of another portion is, truly, pitiable. The virulence and toadyism of *The Pennsylvanian* surprises no one, for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth must speak; but the course pursued by the *Public Ledger*, throughout this whole affair, has been unworthy of itself.

All honour should be rendered to Judge Knox, who, "faithful found among the faithless," ably expounded the law, and asserted the right, in opposition to his fellow-Judges. In the days to come, his name shall be remembered as that of one who sought to stem the tide of lawlessness and moral corruption which is now threatening to overwhelm this land.

And while all this is transpiring, our heroic friend, Passmore Williamson, bravely and patiently endures his imprisonment, happier far than his persecutors and calumniators, who, though they walk abroad with unrestrained footsteps, carry within their breasts the heavy burden of a guilty conscience, to which shall, soon, be added a "fearful-looking for" of the indignation of a roused and justly-incensed people.

MANLY WORDS FROM A CHRISTIAN PULPIT.

Extract from a Discourse, by Rev. WM. H. FURNESS, preached in the First Congregational Unitarian Church in Philadelphia, on Sunday, Sept. 9th.

Reported for The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

I KNOW not how the occurrence of War can ever be rendered impossible, except by the growth of an increased respect for human life and the sacred rights of our common human nature. And this brings me, in the next place, to mention, as the most imposing sign of the times, as the one fact characterizing the age in which we live—the Movement that is now being made, for some five-and-twenty years past, for the Abolition of Bondage on this our soil. I hold it to be the cardinal fact for this age and for the whole world, as, emphatically, the grandest attempt now in progress to realize the Declaration of our fathers and the central truth of the Christian Religion.

It is not a movement made by the will, the caprice, the passion of man. But, from the first, it was anticipated by our wisest men. It had to come, as surely as the sun is bound to rise. It has arisen and assumed its great position, belittling all other movements, crushing all and every who have put themselves in its way, not so much by the instrumentality of man's will as against his will. Beyond the simple consciousness of right and duty (and this, to be sure, is a most precious gift), it has had nothing to give its friends and advocates but obloquy, loss and persecution, and men have been unwilling to help it even with a word. Nevertheless, it has steadily gone on; and every thoughtful man may now see in it a most expressive sign of the times, significant of the Truth and Power of Almighty God.

It is true, as it has proceeded, it has made appalling revelations of the despotic authority with which the Slave Power rules throughout the land. It has shown how confused and blind are the general apprehensions of the first and plainest principles of Justice and Humanity. It has laid bare the wide decay of that spirit of Liberty which alone can maintain free institutions. It has shown what numbers are ready to sacrifice freedom of speech, to hunt and send back the fugitive from slavery, for the sake of personal comfort and for gold. Even now, in the course of its progress, we have new evidence of the might of that unholy, God and man-defying power against which this sacred movement is directed, new evidence in the incarceration—hopeless, it would seem, for anything that the Free and Sovereign State of Pennsylvania can do—of an upright and humane citizen, who has been proved by the clearest evidence to have done only what he was bound to do, not only as a Christian man, but as a loyal citizen of this Free State, and to have said only what was perfectly true before God!

As Slavery had to be attacked, and is to be abolished, so these disclosures of the decay of the spirit of Liberty and of the wide corruption of the public opinion of the country were inevitable. They who first began this holy movement in behalf of the down-trodden saw that the Wrong against which they contended was great, but they did not know, as they have since learned, and as every day is revealing to all the world, how mighty it is. Nevertheless, as one proof after another has come up, each stronger than the last, of the havoc and ruin which slavery has made of the humanity and religion of the people, the friends of human freedom have not abated their opposition one jot. Accepting every new disclosure of the despotism of the Slave Power as a fresh inducement to activity, they speak and labour on in zeal, in hope, in faith, putting their whole trust in God and in His Truth.

And it is this spirit, in which they are baptized, which is giving us, this moment, anointed heroes and martyrs. The present generation, no doubt, will ridicule and reject the gift, and revile, for instance, the unbending integrity and large humanity to which our noble friend now in prison clings at the price of personal liberty, falsely attributing his uprightness to an insanse passion for martyrdom! He is human, and it may be, as our Judges, putting off the dignity of their station, most unworthily insinuate, that our friend is actuated by this folly; but there is nothing in his character, nothing in his recent course, that authorizes them to make any such insinuation. It may be, too—I believe before God that it is so, and all who know him believe likewise—that he has been and is still actuated by the purest motives, that the spirit of Truth and Humanity sways him; and that I hold to be the very spirit of God. How then will it fare with those who have put him in prison and who keep him there, and who are thus fighting against God! But what confession is it of insensibility to the worth of Freedom and Righteousness when men cannot understand what our friend has done—cannot explain his conduct but by resorting to the supposition that he craves to be a martyr, and is so madly bent upon being conspicuous that he rushes into a prison to gain that eminence! Is there, then, no power, no inspiration in the love of liberty, in

born, but he will neither bend nor break before the rod of the tyrant; and as for changing his answer to the writ, I give you his own words, when I say he will "neither dot an i nor cross a t."

After the close of his speech, Mr. McKim offered the following resolutions, which were passed unanimously.

Resolved, That Judge Kane, in his conduct towards Passmore Williamson, in assuming power not within his prerogative; in perverting the *habeas corpus*, that writ of freedom, from its proper use to the purposes of slavery, and in condemning a citizen of the State on a constructive charge, without trial by a jury of his peers, to an indefinite imprisonment, has proved himself to be a despot in the guise of Democracy, and a corrupt and morally incompetent magistrate; and that his conduct not only calls for the reprobation of all honest men, but demands that Congress should be invoked for his impeachment and removal from office.

Resolved, That the action of the Supreme Court of the State, in refusing the *habeas corpus* to Passmore Williamson, has virtually abrogated that time-honoured safeguard of liberty, and, to the extent of its power, has left the citizens of this Commonwealth without protection against the usurpation of the Federal Judiciary.

Resolved, That the language of the Judges in their decision, their heartless sneers at their prisoner's motives, indicate a spirit in the last degree pusillanimous, and are utterly disgraceful to the State of which they are the highest tribunal.

Resolved, That the dissent from this base decision by Knox J., the only non-concurring member of the bench, is highly creditable to that learned gentleman, and that the able and eloquent argument which he has given to the public in defence of his views entitles him to, and should secure for him, the grateful acknowledgements of every true son of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That Passmore Williamson, by the intrepid performance of his duty as a friend of freedom, by his unflinching adherence, in spite of bars and bolts, to truth and principle, has entitled himself to universal honour and the highest regard of every true friend of freedom.

Resolved, That while this meeting assures Passmore Williamson of its sincere admiration and approval, it at the same time tenders to his bereaved wife the expression of its deep and heartfelt sympathy, with the earnest hope that she will be able to bear up under her trials with patience, trusting in God, till her husband is brought forth from his prison with an honourable deliverance.

Mr. McKim read a rough essay of a report, by the Committee of three, appointed at a recent meeting at Norristown, consisting of Rev. James M. Wilson, Edward M. Davis and Prof. Kersey G. Thomas, on the petition for the impeachment of Judge Kane. It was received with immense cheers.

The meeting then adjourned to meet at the same place on Wednesday night, at which time it was announced that Mr. Darsie would be present.

THE LATE REV. DR. CONE.

MESSRS. EDITORS: In passing through your city, on my way to this place, I learned by the morning papers that, on that day, at 2 o'clock—30th instant—the funeral of Spencer H. Cone, D.D., was to take place. Having known the Doctor long, and having been deeply interested in some of the most influential events of the Doctor's career, I naturally felt a desire to be present on that occasion.

The house where the Doctor preached, in Broome street, was densely crowded by the attendants upon his funeral. Dr. Magoon was the preacher, and he delivered a very wordy discourse upon that beautiful passage in the 73d Psalm—"Thou shalt guide me by thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory." In this passage the Doctor found all the dogmas of a higher Calvinistic faith, and with much voice and posturing power set them forth.

In the address, as well as in the prayers, and in some remarks by the somewhat famous Dr. Cox, the deceased was praised as one of the most eminent of Christians. Now, according to the notions which these Divines entertain of Christianity, it is quite true that Dr. Cone was an eminent Christian. No human being was ever more devoted to his creed than was he. He was a sectarian of the first water. Being naturally an enthusiast, he loved the rites and ceremonials of his sect to a boundless idolatry, and always defended them with ability and power. In the performance of these ceremonials, there was none of that dull, cold and monotonous manner so common in the pulpits of this land, but there was earnestness and ardour, that gave to these performances a pleasing and impressive interest. If this be Christianity, then was the eulogium of being an eminent Christian well deserved by Spencer H. Cone. But if, to be an eminent Christian, one must be imbued with that great central, religious truth, "One is your Father, even God, and all ye are brethren"—if it be requisite that one should be engaged in a life-long labour of actualizing the golden rule—if it be to see Jesus in the poor, the outcast and the wronged of the human family, and to extend to these our sympathy and help, at the expense of reputation and even life—then the whole history of this man's life attests that he was a stranger to its divine power and love. I state a fact well known to all who are acquainted with the history of the anti-slavery cause, as connected with the Baptist denomination, in saying that Dr. Cone was always one of the most earnest and virulent opposers of any agitation of this subject. He was always the defender of the slaveholder—always expressed the warmest affection and fellowship for the Baptist slaveholders of the South. In each one of the National Societies connected with the Baptist denomination, whenever the subject of slavery has come up, he has always "*with alacrity*" taken his stand by the side of the slaveholder. He has done more than any other man in the Baptist denomination to keep it in a thoroughly pro-slavery position, and to preserve it pure and clean from any taint of humanity or mercy. In proof of these statements, I will, out of a great number of instances of which I have been a sorrowful witness, give you but one. In 1841, the Baptist Triennial Convention met in the city of Baltimore, Md. Previous to this meeting, a number of Baptist churches in the North had passed resolutions disfellowshipping slaveholders. This had greatly exasperated the Southern brethren; and they had demanded, in the most formal and explicit manner, that the Board of Foreign Missions should be expurgated of Abolitionism. Well, this was done; and a compromise article drawn up, which, for genuine Jesuitism and Satanic sniffle and hypocrisy, is without a parallel in the literature of the world. (See Facts for Baptist Churches, page 75.) The paternity of this compromise is claimed by S. H. Cone, in a letter to the *Baptist Advocate*, in which he says "it cost him six hours of extra labour." This compromise was signed by all the principal ministers North and South, and so here is one of the many instances in which the vexed question has been "*put forever at rest.*"

Immediately upon the close of this Convention, the following notice appeared in the *Biblical Recorder*, a Baptist paper of North Carolina: "Our meeting was truly delightful; the spirit of the Gospel prevailed and gave a tremendous shock to the Abolitionists. Let us be thankful to God and give him all the glory. And now, if we at the South, and they at the North, whose sympathies are with us, shall be mild, I am satisfied that Abolitionism will go down among the Baptists. All our principal men are sound to the *core* on this *vexed question*. The Triennial Convention exhibited a noble specimen of moral grandeur. About two hundred and fifty men, from the various parts of our extended country, were engaged in a long and arduous session, under circumstances that tried the temper and put into requisition all the intellectual energy which they possessed. And all this upon a most exciting subject. And yet, self-possession, calmness, the Christian spirit predominated throughout the whole scene. * *

At the communion board, on Lord's day, the scene was overwhelming. In view of the *Cross*, the hundreds that participated were all one. No test other than our dear Lord's requirements were thought of. To God be all the glory. Amen, and Amen."

Remark—it is not a single instance of departure from the right, but a life devoted to the interests of slavery. And yet, he is an "eminent Christian"!

Dr. Magoon told us of his "great heart." It was, indeed, big enough to hold the oppressor, but in no corner was there ever room for the oppressed.

Much was said of the wealth of character which he left to his boys. Now, for aught that has ever appeared to the contrary in the example and teachings of this man, his boys, under the legitimate influence of this example and teachings, may become slaveholders in South Carolina, or Hard Shell Democrats in New York. And this is the highest type of American Religion.

Messrs. Editors, I have not written these words from any unkindness of feeling toward Dr. Cone, nor with any desire to wound the feelings of his surviving friends, but only with a desire to discharge my duty to God and Humanity.

A. T. Foss.

Norristown, Pa., Sept. 24, 1855.

THE YELLOW FEVER still rages at Norfolk and Portsmouth. The reports of suffering among the people are enough to appal the stoutest heart. We are glad to see that liberal contributions for the relief of the destitute, the sick and the dying, are being made in various places. H. W. Beecher's congregation contributed £500 on Sunday last.

Our Philadelphia Correspondence.

Unrighteous Judgment of the Supreme Court—Honour to Judge Knox—Judge Lowrie's Change of Opinion—His Disquietude—Noble Testimony of W. H. Furness—Firmness of Passmore Williamson—Great Anti-Slavery Meeting—Public Indignation—Speeches of Messrs. Foss, Aaron and McKim.

PHILADELPHIA, 9th mo. 10th, 1855.

THE independence of Pennsylvania, as a sovereign State of the Confederacy, received a traitorous stab from her highest judicial functionaries on Saturday last. The petition of Passmore Williamson, praying for the issue of a writ of *habeas corpus* to release him from illegal and unjust imprisonment, was refused; four of the five Judges, elected by the people to guard their most sacred rights from invasion, having ignominiously quailed before the mandate of Judge Kane and the United States Government. I shall not enter into the examination of the law, logic and morality revealed by the decision of Judge Black, and concurred in by a majority of the bench; I will now speak only of the feeling of blank disappointment, which fell upon us like a shroud, on hearing it read. Ten days ago, no one would have been surprised to hear of such a refusal; and, indeed, the friends of Passmore Williamson expected the Supreme Court to play the servile part in which Pennsylvania politicians have earned such a disgraceful notoriety; but early in last week it was announced, on good authority, that the Court would sit *in banc* on Friday, and we began to hope that the Judges who, at the last meeting, had adjourned to an early day in October, had heard some whisperings of the gale rising among the people and had deemed it wise to anticipate their appointed time and release their oppressed fellow-citizen. So, indeed, they had. On Friday it was very currently reported, and on the authority of members of the Supreme Bench, that Judges Knox, Lowrie and Woodward had agreed to grant the writ, while Lewis and Black dissented. Persons in the most intimate confidence of Judge Kane made no secret of this fact. The time appointed for the meeting of the Court found the Court-Room filled with an audience in which the most eminent legal talent and the most exalted social position of our city were largely represented. To the disappointment of all, the announcement was made that the Court was to sit to decide the case on the following day. It was very generally feared that some stratagem was on foot, by which Freedom should again be cheated, and we despoiled of the last hope of protection from the assaults of the central government. On Saturday an eager throng again filled the Court-Room, and our hopes sunk or rose with the conflicting reports which one and another brought as to the position of the Bench. But suspense was changed to a sad certainty, soon after Judge Black commenced reading the decision, which condemned Passmore Williamson to cringe to Judge Kane and admit himself a perjured villain, or to lie helplessly in Moyamensing Prison.

Here I will say nothing of this decision. There is another than Judge Black upon whom the eyes of the audience were then and the eyes of the community are now fixed, Justice (how deep the irony of such a name!) Lowrie. How he will justify himself before God and the world, he alone knows. He admitted that when he arrived in the city he had reached a different conclusion from that just read, but that his mind had undergone a change upon a material point since meeting his brethren. There is an eager curiosity felt by the public to know by what potent arguments the Judge was persuaded to hush the voice of justice, which his meditations in the country had inspired him with, to join in the harsh notes with which Judge Black brazened forth the supremacy of injustice and unreason. Before the people, and at the hands of posterity, these men have a fearful reckoning to encounter, and the judicial doughface, who could not stand the corrupting influence of the Government head-quarters, one short day will meet with a no less ignominious doom than he to whom the spirit of subserviency and despotism was native and spontaneous.

Judge Knox then read a dissenting decision. It does him great honour as a man and an upholder of State Rights. As a legal document, I doubt not it compares very favourably with the decision of the majority. It was earnest, manly, eloquent, and made a deep impression upon his hearers. It appealed at once to the popular heart, and I mistake the pulse of public feeling if it does not elevate Judge Knox to a place in public esteem such as no other Judge of the Supreme Court has ever occupied. Judges stand removed from the people, and do not often come within the circle of popular sympathies. But Judge Knox has spoken the word with which the people's heart throbs, and he may look forward to a bright future, Judge Lowrie was a study during the reading of Judge Knox's opinion. His was evidently a perturbed spirit, and if his uneasy gesture, his sweat-bedewed brow, and his flaming eye might be taken as indications, he felt himself in the pillory. And truly, if that was the decree which he had accepted as his voice, his conscience might well be disturbed as he heard it read. Judge Lewis concurred in the decision of Judge Black, and, so far as I could understand, Judge Woodward said nothing.

You will see that the decision has left us, openly and plainly, subjects of the worst form of despotism. An Absolute Government, with an Autocrat as supreme ruler at its head, is bad enough; but a Government exposing us to petty and irresponsible despots in every community is far worse. In Russia, if I should speak ill of the Government, I may be punished by a subordinate, but an appeal to the Czar is open to me. In Pennsylvania, I may be condemned by the pettiest justice for contempt of Court, and, according to the Supreme Court, there is no authority under heaven, short of the impeaching power, to give me redress. Are not our Aldermen competent to decide cases of contempt, and is not this power necessary to the administration of justice? And if Judge Black's decision is law, there is no power to revise the judgment of a Court of competent jurisdiction in a case of contempt.

Yet, after all, the conduct of Judge Kane and the endorsement which it has received from our State authorities were necessary to show us by what a feeble tenure we hold our own rights, and to deepen our sympathy for those robbed of all rights. We now grow indignant, we feel the iron enter our own souls. We feel that we are liable at any moment to be thrust hopelessly into prison. Shall we not take to heart the lesson taught to us so bitterly, and reflect that when the worst has been meted out that these petty tyrants can impose upon us, it still falls far short of what the poor slave may suffer every day. We may be cast into prison, but our wives and children may not be sold from us to death or infamy. We have not felt as we should the wrongs of the coloured man, and now we have the bitter cup pressed to our lips. May it be kept there till we find that, to remove the shackles from our own feet, we must lift the chain from his neck.

Leaving the general views suggested by this infamous decision, let me recur to the hero and martyr who stands in the forefront of the battle. I need not tell you that Passmore Williamson is unmoved and immoveable. I saw him this morning. He is the most cheerful man, almost the only cheerful man, I have seen to-day. He looks his fate *firmly in the face, whatever it may be.* He feels that it has fallen to his lot to be the standard-bearer in the cause of human rights, and in a most important position in the great battle, and he bears himself worthy of his calling.

I cannot forbear quoting, in this connection, a passage from a sermon delivered last Sunday week by that true friend of man, W. H. FURNESS. This was the first occasion on which he had addressed his congregation since the arrest of Passmore Williamson, and he bore the following faithful testimony: "The opportunities for this use of the beneficent outgushings of the heart are not distant nor rare. They are close at hand, for every man, in simple human duties, in acts of common justice and humanity, such as that which Passmore Williamson did the other day, and for which he has been deprived of his sacred liberty. Shame upon us all, his fellow-citizens, that the air was not instantly rent in twain by the roar of public indignation! How generous was that act of his! It was not a gift of money. Whether he have much or little of that to give, I do not know. But he gave *himself*. He gave us all the assurance of a just and humane man, doing as he would be done by. That gift he is still giving us in his unswerving integrity. How precious is that gift at this juncture, and in this community, so absorbed in the pursuit and love of gain, so mournfully insensible to humane and self-sacrificing sentiments. It is worth a thousand resolutions passed by public meetings. It is the gift of a true Christian act, an unpopular human duty faithfully performed. Our friend and brother (who is not fond of the relationship?), in his fidelity to the simple obligations of humanity, shows himself in accord with the beneficence of universal Nature, with the life-giving Summer and the abundant Autumn. The great example of all-giving Heaven has not been lost on him. O! my friends, let it not be lost upon us!"

You will remember that an application was made by Passmore Williamson's physician, without his knowledge, for a change of his apartment. The Judge, as you are aware, referred the applicant to the Marshal. A few days afterward, Marshal Wynkoop called upon Mr. Williamson, stating that he had understood that, during his (the Marshal's) absence in the country, an application for a change of cell had been made by his physician, without his suggestion, and that he had come to hear what his wishes were upon the subject. Passmore answered that he considered his imprisonment a gross outrage, and that he was not in a position to express wishes or accept favours. The Marshal left at once, saying something about his being merely an administrative officer. I think no one will fail to recognise the propriety and dignity of Mr. Williamson's conduct. He is thrown into prison by a most tyrannical and unjustifiable procedure. His persecutors wish to relieve themselves of the odium, which they feel growing around them, without retracing their steps; but Passmore Williamson is not the man to lift *one jot or tittle of the self-imposed burden from their shoulders.*

If I mistake not, the people will, this Fall, take Passmore Williamson in their special charge, and administer such a rebuke to the servile minions of slavery as will reach even their cotton-filled ears. But I have no time for specific speculations upon this head. C.

PHILADELPHIA, 9th mo. 11th, 1855.

The tyranny of Judge Kane and the disgraceful servility of our Supreme Court have aroused a feeling of indignation in the community, which I hope will not soon slumber. After closing my letter last evening, I dropped into an anti-slavery meeting, call to hear Mr. Foss. Everybody knew, however, that Judge Kane would take a conspicuous place before the audience, for the people seem not to tire of execrating his name and conduct. It is years since I have attended such a meeting in this city. You know that with Wendell Phillips or Emerson we have, of late, only been able to get Sansom Hall half filled. Last night, Washington Hall, capable of holding 800 or 1,000 persons, was crowded beyond its utmost capacity, for the aisles and doorways were blocked with earnest listeners. The large audience responded to the eloquent appeals of Mr. Foss, and the withering denunciations of Mr. Aaron, with the enthusiasm of people thoroughly aroused to the danger which threatens them. Resolutions denouncing Judge Kane and calling for his impeachment, commending Judge Knox for his manly conduct, sympathizing with Passmore Williamson and his family, and gratefully acknowledging the services they are rendering the cause of human rights by their unbending firmness, were passed, by acclamation.

You know it takes a great deal to make a Philadelphia audience applaud vociferously, or to get them to speak above a whisper in passing a resolution. The meeting adjourned till Wednesday evening, when, you may rely upon it, Washington Hall will be crowded again. Mr. Aaron will continue his review of the actors in this case. Mr. Darsie and Mr. Campbell, of Pittsburg, were also announced.

The most intense feeling is manifested everywhere, and I think that a State Executive Committee, consisting of others than technical Abolitionists, should be appointed to agitate the State for the release of the prisoner.

You will see that the Republican Convention has nominated Passmore Williamson for Canal Commissioner. It is possible that he will be the candidate of a fusion of all the anti-Administration elements in the State. Leading Know-Nothings, even of this city, advocate his nomination, and in the country the feeling of sympathy and admiration for him is much stronger than here. You need not be surprised if the public, in the Fall, should claim possession of Mr. Williamson as their servant, and bring him out of jail by a writ *de homine replegiando*, or *Canal Commissionerendo*. C.

PUBLIC OPINION DOING ITS WORK.—It has been supposed hitherto, that however difficult it might be to enforce the Fugitive Slave law in other parts of this State, in Buffalo, the focus of hunkerism and the residence of Millard Fillmore and Judge Hall, no serious obstacle would present itself in the path of the slave-hunter. But, alas for the comfort of our American patriarchs! the fanaticism of the Higher Law has penetrated even the domains of the Ex-President, causing his tools to falter in their allegiance to the Union! The *Romney Intelligencer*, published in Hampshire County, Virginia, gives an account of the mission of Captain John Harness, of Hardy County, to Buffalo, New York, where a slave of his had been imprisoned for some misdemeanour. Captain H. was accompanied by several friends, who were to aid him in the recovery of the negro. The *Intelligencer* says:

"They found, upon their arrival in Buffalo, the negro fellow still in jail. *They applied to every lawyer of any respectability in the city to prepare the necessary papers, but could not obtain one, though liberal fees were offered.* They applied to the firm of Smith & Haven—Smith had, a year or two ago, we understand, obtained, under the provisions of the Fugitive act, a slave belonging to Dr. Parran, of Hardy—but the firm positively refused having anything to do with the matter, owing, as they said, to the excited state of the popular mind on the subject. Bowen, the United States Commissioner, refused to aid them in any manner in preparing their papers.

"The Hon. H. W. Rogers, the law partner of Bowen, and the President of the Hard Democratic Convention, which assembled in Syracuse, New York, last week, upon being applied to, through a friend, positively refused to act in the matter! Judge Hall even said to a friend of Captain H. that Captain H. had better not push matters—that even if he obtained possession of the negro, the mob would rescue him—but that if Capt. H. insisted, that he, Judge Hall, *would do his duty.* The reasons assigned by these lawyers were that they were afraid of a mob. Captain H. was finally compelled to leave."

That eminently religious sheet, the *Commercial Advertiser* of this city (owned and conducted by leading members of the Northern Methodist Church), laments the misfortune of Captain John Harness in being unable to catch his slave, and regards the conduct of the Buffalo officials as evidence of an alarming degeneracy in the state of public opinion. That our Southern brethren should be obstructed in their efforts to save the souls of their fugitive bondmen by bringing them under the Christainizing and and purifying influence of slavery, grieves its pious heart!

CURTIS AND BALLARD, the two coloured men who were convicted of an assault and battery upon Col. John H. Wheeler, have been sentenced by Judge Kelley to pay a fine of $10 each and the costs of prosecution, and be imprisoned one week. Before sentence was passed, Mr. Pierce, the counsel for the men, offered evidence in extenuation of any punishment the Court might think proper to inflict. It was then submitted in evidence that these men, when arrested on the 19th of July last, were taken to the Cherry street station-house and locked in a cell with three others (arrested for the same offence), and kept there twenty hours without food, the thermometer standing at ninety-five degrees. The heat in the cell was so intolerable that the men had to strip off all their clothes. They were taken thence to prison, where they were incarcerated ten days, and only released by the interposition of the Court of Quarter Sessions. The counsel called two of the former co-defendants of the prisoners, and they both swore that Ballard was not on the upper deck of the boat at all.

Judge Kelley told the men that they would have had a perfect right to go to the boat and tell the woman Jane of her rights; but that by their actions they had injured the cause they no doubt at heart wished to serve. He reproved them for the use of violence, and the threatening language they had used.

The Judge then told the men that, in the sentence he was about to pass upon them, he had in view the circumstances of the case—the outrageous holding to bail (by Alderman Charles D. Freeman) in an enormous sum (a sum, he said, which, if asked in a similar case, from a wealthy and influential man, surrounded by friends, would have been thought unreasonable), the suffering they had been subjected to, and the fact that a very large witness bill had been presented against them.

It is stated in our Philadelphia correspondence that measures have been taken to relieve these victims of Wheeler's perjury of the pecuniary burden thus imposed upon them. This is as it should be. The imprisonment will be no disgrace to them, but an honour of which they may well be proud.

MEETINGS IN PENNSYLVANIA.—We invite particular attention to the notice, which will be found under the proper head, of a series of meetings in Bucks and Philadelphia Counties, to be attended by Mr. Foss and others. We are glad to perceive signs that the friends of freedom in Pennsylvania are awaking to a sense of the duties devolving upon them at this crisis.

MEETINGS IN BYBERRY, PA.—There will be anti-slavery meetings this (Saturday) evening, and to-morrow afternoon, at the Hall in Byberry; the former of which will be addressed by Mr. Foss, and the latter by the same gentleman, and other speakers who are expected from Philadelphia.

VERMONT has elected the Republican State ticket, and a Legislature of the same sort, by a large majority.

"CONTEMPT OF COURT."—Under the above heading a correspondent of the Boston *Daily Transcript*—understood to be N. I. BOWDITCH, Esq.—thus introduces an article in which he maintains his right to differ from certain decisions of the Massachusetts Supreme Court in cases of real estate:

"Your correspondent 'Z.' seems to regard me as quite *presuming*, in expressing a doubt of the correctness of certain decisions of our Supreme Court. He dwells with much emphasis on the indisputable talent and learning of its several members, and announces the long period of time which they had devoted to the consideration of the case alluded to. Admitting that there is a province in which I may legitimately form and express an opinion, that might be entitled to some weight, he yet considers that I wholly transcend that province, when I undertake to judge *what land* is conveyed by a deed, or *what title* passes by a will. I really conceive that with these two deductions there is nothing left for a conveyancer, these being *the two* fundamental matters of inquiry involved in *every* investigation which he is called upon to make.

"I deem it *the right*—aye, more than that—*the duty* of every loyal member of the profession fairly and candidly to criticise any legal decision which he shall think erroneous, from however high a tribunal it may emanate; and although it may happen to be founded on a deliberation of *two*, or even *fifteen*, years. I certainly yield to no one in respect for the law and its ministers," &c.

And he thus aptly, and with a spirit worthy of the illustrious name he bears, closes his communication:

"Infallibility is the attribute only of the judgment seat of God. Already there exists a large volume devoted to the enumeration of 'cases doubted and overruled.'

"We have no Judge Kane in this latitude. Imprisonment in the sacred cause of human freedom, under the odious doctrine of *contempt of Court*—an imprisonment perpetuated by judicial etiquette—has made the jail of *Passmore Williamson* the most honourable abode in *Pennsylvania*. The ermine of *Massachusetts* has upon it no such spot or blemish. *Her* judges need *no* champion—certainly not one who resorts to personalities. They may, indeed, challenge the just criticism of the world. Far distant be the day when they shall feel themselves *above* listening to the honest sentiments of even the humblest citizen!"

JUDGE KANE IN THE RURAL DISTRICTS.—The *Evening Post* relates that Judge Kane went, some days since, to Media, the capital of Delaware County, where, on alighting from the cars, he asked a person, standing near, if he knew where Mr. M—— lived.

"Yes, sir, I am going directly by his residence."

"Well, will you be good enough to inform him that Judge Kane wishes to see him?"

"Judge Kane! Are you Judge Kane?"

"Yes, sir."

"Well, sir, I advise you to be a little careful how you move about here; you are not in very good repute in these parts. If you don't keep a good look out, they'll mob you."

After some further colloquy, the man agreed to inform Mr. M—— that Judge Kane wished to see him, and did so. Mr. M—— promptly replied:

"Judge Kane! I don't want to see *him*. What in the devil does he want with *me*?"

MAINE, it appears, at the late election on Monday last, was carried by the united power of Rum and Slavery. The prohibitory law will, we suppose, be repealed, and, for one year at least, the State will be under the control of pro-slavery hunkers, of the most unscrupulous sort. This result is attributable, in no small degree, to the deadly influence of the *Christian Mirror*, which for years has inculcated practical atheism in the name of Christianity. Its praises of late have been the theme of the toper, the liquor-seller and the tools of the Slave Power. Its poison has infected the churches and the pulpits of the State to a lamentable extent.

Summary.

RESPECT TO A SLAVE'S MEMORY.—On Tuesday the store of E. P. Nash, at Petersburg, Va., was closed in the morning, through respect for the memory of Erasmus, an old and faithful slave, who died the day before.

TRUE CHARITY.—Hon. Henry A. Wise has fitted up his dwelling-house, barns, and every other place of shelter, and invited thither the afflicted people of Norfolk and Portsmouth, Va., assuring them a most cordial welcome.

PREPARING FOR SLAVE-TRADING.—It is stated that contracts have been made for the introduction, this year, into the Island of Cuba, of large numbers of African slaves. One party alone has contracted for the supply of 7,000. Portuguese agents, it is said, are now in New York making arrangements.

REV. FREDERICK FROTHINGHAM, of Montreal, has accepted the call of the Second Unitarian Society (Park street) of Portland to become their pastor. We believe that this is the gentleman whose pungent preaching drove the Dorchester Hunkers out of their pews, a few Sundays ago.—*Bost. Tel.*

SENATOR WILSON returned to Massachusetts yesterday, from a visit to Maine and Vermont. Within six days, he travelled 840 miles, and made seven speeches, occupying in all some twelve hours. To morrow he will start for Michigan, and will be absent two or three weeks.—*Bost. Tel., 6th.*

DEATH OF A COLOURED VOLUNTEER.—Among our obituary notices this morning will be found one recording the death of William Savage, one of the three coloured musicians who served in the Washington Regiment of Louisiana Volunteers in Gen. Persifor Smith's brigade.—*N. O. Picayune, Aug. 31.*

THE CITY'S SHAME.—From the Auditor's report of the city expenses for the last financial year, just issued, we copy the following:

"BURNS CASE.—Extra expenses of maintaining the peace of city during the trial and surrender of Anthony Burns, a fugitive slave from Virginia, $2,727 60."—*Bost. Tel.*

A COLOURED PATRIOT.—The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* advocates the erection of a monument to the memory of Peter Francisco, a coloured man, born a slave in Virginia, but emancipated at the commencement of the Revolution, and enlisted as a soldier. He served all through the war, and was subsequently Sergeant-at-arms of the Virginia Legislature.

We regret to learn that Rev. John Pierpont is seriously ill, at his residence in Medford, Mass. His son, Rev. J. Pierpont, Jr., of the Unitarian Church, in Savannah, Ga., has been called home by this affliction, and the still deeper one of the death of his mother, which occurred a few days since, at Medford, after a long illness.

COOL—VERY.—On Mount Washington, the highest peak of the White Mountains in New Hampshire, a young lady is reported to have frozen her face on the 17th of August. Ice formed there that morning to considerable thickness. On the same day, at Quebec, the atmosphere was clear and dry, and sheltered from the wind it was pretty comfortable; but thick woolen shawls and overcoats were the rule, not the exception.

HON. CHARLES SUMNER arrived in Boston last evening, from his tour of four months in the West. He returned through New Hampshire and Maine, and walked down Mount Washington on Monday. During his tour, he visited every free State in the Union except California, three of the slave States, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri. He is in excellent health and spirits.—*Boston Telegraph, 16th.*

PROGRESSIVE CONVENTION AT WAVERLY.—A letter in the Syracuse *Chronicle*, from Oliver Mitchell, of De Ruyter, informs us that the meeting of Friends of Human Progress, held on the 19th, 20th and 21st of August, at Waverly, not far from Elmira, Chemung Co., was well attended and very interesting. Joseph Barker, of Ohio, Ernestine L. Rose, of New York, and Thomas McClintock, of Waterloo, N. Y., were present. Letters were received from Cassius M. Clay, Joseph A. Dugdale and others. A more detailed account of the proceedings will, in due time, appear, probably in pamphlet form.

A SLAVE CASE AT CINCINNATI.—A few days ago, as Mr. Thomas C. Lannan was passing through Cincinnati, en route for Montgomery County, Md., some of the Abolitionists induced a slave in his possession to leave him and remain behind. Mr. L. has addressed a letter to the Mayor of that city, asking that he may be returned, as he will certainly become a charge to the city. He says he is between 70 and 80 years of age, limps from rheumatism, is blind of one eye, totally incompetent to labour, and has done nothing for three years. He sympathizes with the old slave and is anxious to have him with him, so that he may support him until he dies.

In 1780, *seven years* before the Constitution of the United States was formed, Massachusetts abolished slavery entirely; Pennsylvania prospectively, the same year; New Hampshire totally, a year or two after; and Connecticut and Rhode Island prospectively, in 1784, making five States which were free from three to seven years before the United States Constitution was formed; and from five to nine before the government was organized. If it be said that the Union was formed in 1774 or 1777, we reply, it was not *the* Union, it was not THIS Union. It was an alliance of independent States, which recognised no slave representation, and no right, no obligation to pursue or surrender a fugitive slave.

A FEMALE FIRE DEPARTMENT.—The fire engines at Yarmouth are *manned* chiefly by females, who volunteer for the service whenever the occasion offers. They have been *called out* on two occasions recently and behaved nobly. The *Register* remarks that the vigorous exercise attendant upon these exertions so much improved the complexion, and brightened the charms of the ladies, that several desperate bachelors have expressed their intention to set fire to some other buildings, for the pleasure of seeing "the department" turn out in force!

Wonder if they would extend the customary hospitalities to *visiting* Firemen?—*New Bedford (Mass.) Standard.*

COLOURED PERSONS IN PUBLIC CONVEYANCES.—Rev. Mr. Gloster, a coloured clergyman, has made a representation to us in regard to certain harsh treatment sustained by his wife at the hands of persons employed on Kipp & Brown's line of stages. On Saturday afternoon, Mrs. G. was ejected by violence from an omnibus of this line at the terminus, Bowling Green. Mr. Gloster was witness of the fact. His wife entered the stage first, having a child in her arms, but was immediately ordered out by the driver, who began beating her in the back. Another man then jumped in and seized her by the throat, leaving there the print of his nails. Neither Mr. Gloster nor his wife were permitted to enter the vehicle again.—*N. Y. Times.*

"OLD AARON."—We were in the cars coming from Providence, a few days ago, when we discovered an old coloured man on board, whom we knew many years ago, and whom everybody in the vicinity of Kingston knows by the name of "Old Aaron." Aaron is the oldest man, we believe, in Washington County. He was born in South Kingston, near the factory of Messrs. Samuel Rodman & Sons, in the year 1758, and consequently is now 97 years old. He has lived in the vicinity of Kingston nearly all his days. He was, however, on board the United States ship Chesapeake for two years, and was in the memorable engagement between the Chesapeake and the Leopard. For a number of years past he has lived alone, having never been married for ever wished to be. He alway wears a white apron, so white that the snow might envy it, with a turban tied over his raven pate where "the wool ought to grow." He has generally been engaged in doing housework. As a washer, starcher and ironer, Aaron has but few superiors. Everybody and his family love to meet him—he is so polite and pleasant, and, for over half a century, they have looked back after parting with him, and said, "poor old Aaron."—*East Greenwich (R. I.) Pendulum.*

DEATH OF REV. GEO. F. SIMMONS.—We mentioned, a few weeks ago, that the Rev. G. F. Simmons, Unitarian clergyman, of Albany, had returned with his family to Concord, Mass., in a state of health which rendered it improbable that he could live many weeks. His death took place on Wednesday last. Some months ago he had an attack of lung fever, which left him in a consumption. Mr. Simmons was a man of superior talents, and of great conscientiousness in the performance of duty. He was compelled to leave Mobile, some years ago, on account of his faithfulness to his anti-slavery convictions, and while settled at Springfield, in this State, he also gave offence to the pro-slavery portion of his congregation, and for that reason left the city. He was about 40 years old, and has left a wife and four children.—*Boston Telegraph, 8th.*

THE LOSS OF THE TELEGRAPH CABLE.—After all the delay, trouble and anxiety in regard to laying the telegraph cable on the Newfoundland line, we learned yesterday that it had been lost from the steamer James Adger, when forty miles out, and after having occupied two days in laying it. This is very unfortunate. But how was it lost? Was not at least one end made fast? or was there no end to it, and it all dropped out at the middle? "Gentlemen, I give you

The Electric Telegraph—

The steed called Lightning (say the Fates)
Was tamed in the United States:
'Twas Franklin's hand that caught the horse—
'Twas harnessed by Professor Morse;
But let us now all cease to badger,
For the steed is lost from steamer Adger."

—*Boston Times.*

A GOOD SLAVE.—A correspondent of the *Maysville Eagle* says that, during the prevalence of the Cholera at Flemingsburg, Ky., a few days ago, the jailor, Dillon Bridges, died of the same, and although it was a rapid and malignant case, and almost every one was leaving and avoiding the same that *could* leave, and although there had been about sixty deaths immediately in and around the place, yet there remained one, a true and lasting friend. It was Martin, a slave of the late John Lawson, deceased, of Fleming County, Ky., who by his will had emancipated Martin, but a set of hungry and contentious heirs contested the will of his old master, and had Martin committed to the jailor of Fleming, pending the contest of the will, for want of bail or security, under our statutes and Judges' orders, regulating such cases. Although Martin's liberty was at stake, his life in danger, &c., yet he remained and nursed his own jailor to the last, when others, unrestrained, deserted; and he still remains to protect and support the family, although in fact not a prisoner under lock and key.

U. S. DISTRICT COURT—Judge Kane.—*Manumission of a Georgian Slave by the Master.*—Yesterday morning a female slave, aged 35, from Georgia, accompanied by her master, made application on a *habeas corpus* to be declared free and released from the custody and control of her master, therein named.

The master made reply, that it is true the said negro woman (named), now in the possession of defendant, was formerly his slave for life, and resided with him in the State of Georgia, but he does not now claim to hold her as a slave, having consented that she should be free, and permitted her to come to Philadelphia to reside as a free woman; he having thereby renounced all claim to her and her services, and admits that she is free by his voluntary act of manumission, and is willing that the Court shall make a decree that shall fully certify these facts, and be hereafter the evidence that she is free. The Court decreed accordingly.

The southern master brought his slave to Philadelphia for the purpose of manumitting her, as that act cannot be performed in the State of Georgia.—*Phil. Gaz., Sept. 4.*

MASSASOIT GUARDS.—Robert Morris, the commander of this company of coloured young men of Boston, in a communication to the *Telegrpph*, gives the following extract from the letter of the Governor, in which that functionary, under instructions from the Attorney-General, refused to furnish the company with a stand of the State arms:

"As a lawyer, the reasons assigned by the Attorney-General for declining to accede to your request must, I think, be convincing, though it certainly seems as if the framers of our Federal laws were too unmindful of the bravery with which the coloured citizens, side by side with their white brethren, poured out their blood in the battles that initiated, prolonged and concluded, on land and sea, the struggle which secured our independent existence as a nation."

The company now proposes to raise by subscription the means to purchase arms and equipments. Mr. Morris says it is not founded on *caste;* its ranks are open to all citizens of good moral character, who may wish to enroll their names among its members. Despising, as we do, the entire military system, and believing it to be a curse to the world, we regret that the coloured young men of Boston are ambitious to become soldiers; but we respect the manly firmness with which they assert their inalienable rights in this particular.

COLOURPHOBIA.—We were recently witness to the sifting process on the old West Chester Railroad, whereby the passengers are assorted out into lots according to the colour they happen to have inherited. Coloured persons are very carefully handed into a corner by themselves, unless they happen to be acting in the capacity of nurses or servants. This ought not to surprise us if existing in the South, or anywhere else in the world but in a region under Quaker influence like Chester County. To the credit of the Norristown Railroad Company, such a regulation has never obtained on any of its lines since its construction; and the Valley trains which run close to those above alluded to make no distinction on such a contemptibly silly basis. To the still further credit of our road they have never introduced the far more rational, yet unnecessary, classification of the passengers into No. 1 and No. 2 travellers; or high price and low fare seats. The Reading Railroad, however, that thus sorts its passengers on the basis of the rate of fare, can claim a better excuse for the practice than their West Chester cotemporaries, for many white men and women like to enjoy alone the fumes of rum and tobacco. Indeed, tobacco smoking is the only kind of *aristocratic* distinction allowed on the Norristown Railroad.

While on this subject of colourphobia, we might further remark, to the credit of Norristown, that our new line of Omnibusses allows no exclusion of men and women because they are not white.—*Norristown (Pa.) Olive Branch.*

Special Notices.

ANTI-SLAVERY LECTURES IN BUCKS AND PHILADELPHIA COUNTIES, PA.—A. T. FOSS, of New Hampshire, an able and well-tried advocate of Human Rights, will lecture as follows:

Byberry Hall,	Sept. 15	(evening) and 16

Miscellaneous Department.

For The Standard.

THE TWO PICTURES.

THE sun set on an ocean, o'er which sailed
A ship slave-freighted; cloud rose o'er cloud
Girdling the horizon as with a belt
Of gold and purple, for the zoneless Night:
The sun sinks to his home, and darkness vast
Rests like a grotesque giant, on the sea.
No moon or cheering star appears to guide
That lonely prison-ship; the free North wind,
In ominous disquiet, sighs and shrieks,
Telling its plained legend to the skies!
Still, onward sails the galleon—astern
Is golden Africa, torrid and blurred—
A tawny mother weeping for her young!

Anon the scene is changed, and tempest wild
Enshrouds the sea with horror. Through the night,
Opaque and palpable, the ship reels on,
A wreck, hopeless and shattered. In her throes
The bonds are loosened which confine the slaves.
And o'er the decks they stalk, vengeful and wild.
Yet all unconscious of impending doom.
'T was their first knowledge of that mighty sea,
Which had delivered them; why should they fear
In this their hour of triumph? Who shall say
That vengeance was unjust which rioted
In bloodiest saturnalia? . . . . . Morn came,
But Ocean hid another tragedy;
Death claimed alike the wronger and the wronged.

The sun sets on a Nation, whose domain
Stretches from sea to sea—but in whose States
Oppression reigns in terror—like a ship,
Freighted with living victims, whom the sun
Scorched into darkness; an unhappy throng
Prisoned in her midst; branded, and alleged,
And full-of strength, though impotent through fear!

Are there no storms save those of elements?
Are States ne'er wrecked like vessels? Can we make
Prosperity perpetual? Can chains,
Bars, stripes, or death, imprison Mind?—or graft
Foul crime on Nature's garden? Will the night
Ne'er usher tempests to destroy our homes,
And arm the enfranchised band against our peace?
Oh! Providence, remove a Nation's blindness—
Curse not our children for the oppressor's deed!

HENDIBOE.

DOCTORING BEGINS AT HOME.

[From Household Words.]

THE very few people who, in the vast and absorbing excitement of the war, administrative reform, and Lord Robert Grosvenor's Sunday bill, can afford to look back seven years, will remember a political event of some importance in France, known as the revolution of eighteen hundred and forty-eight. They may also, by a great exertion of memory, call to mind that, among the numerous men of rank who were moved to launch their barques (more or less frail), on that stormy sea of politics, was M. F. V. Raspail, hitherto known only to the scientific world as an eminent chemist. M. Raspail's experience of political seamanship was short, violent, and disastrous. Unmindful of the pilot's reiterated advice to go down, and that it was no place for him, he persisted in declaring his inability to sleep, and his determination to come and pace the deck. He did so; but though he may have carried out the pilot's recommendations (as made metrical in the popular ballad), as far as fearing not and trusting in Providence went, his little skiff, like some other craft of far heavier tonnage, soon foundered, and he suffered a lengthened imprisonment in the Donjon of Vincennes and the Citadel of Douellens. He has since been enabled to pursue his chemical experiments in a larger and healthier laboratory, and though still a republican of the "loudest" red, is content to view the raging of the waves, and the tossing of the ships, and the agonies of those who go down to the sea in them, from the shores of Brussels, and through the medium of a newspaper telescope.

The republicanism of François Vincent Raspail having nothing to do with doctors or with the discount to which he seeks to bring them, I claim leave to discourse upon him here as the author of a remarkable book, called the Manual Annuaire de la Sante, published in France, at the close of every autumn, in the company of the crowds of almanacs and ephemerides in which the French neighbours take delight, and which in many parts of the provinces form the staple reading of the population. This manual has had, from its commencement in eighteen hundred and forty-five, a prodigious circulation in France. The author declares that five hundred thousand copies were sold of the first edition alone; in addition to which, there have been numerous Belgian and Genevese piracies, two Spanish translations, one German, one Brazilian, and one Anglo-American. The only translation in Great Britain dates from about two years back, and is a carefully edited pamphlet by Doctor G. L. Strauss.

Three reasons prompt me to give an outline of the contents of this medical and pharmaceutical keepsake. In the first instance, M. Raspail is the inventor of an entirely new system of medicine; in the second, I should like the book itself to be known, because, "while binding nature fast in fate," it "leaves free the human will"; that is, while stating many admirable and incontrovertible truths relative to our organization, our diseases and their causes, it allows the reader perfect liberty to assume and set down the author as a quack and a visionary. In the third, I believe M. Raspail to be, though in many instances a mistaken, yet in all cases a thoroughly honest man.

It may also have contributed in no small degree to the interest I feel in the subject, that I have, or fancy I have, always something the matter with me; that I have been, to my sorrow, the patient and victim of professors of every system of medicine, orthodox and heterodox: from Doctor Sangrado, the phlebotomist and hydropathist, to Doctor Infinitesimal, the homœopathist; and that I have suffered in my miserable body almost every experiment, on this side of amputation, that the old Latin axiom suggests should be made in corpore vili. So, with all due respect to the faculty, to Apothecaries' Hall, to the Pharmaceutical Society, and to Buchan's Domestic Medicine, let us see what M. Raspail can teach us towards that desirable consummation of—Every Man his own Doctor.

Health, Raspail maintains, is the normal or regular state of life, fitting man for the performance of his natural and social duties. Illness is the exceptional state; it reduces him to the position of a useless encumbrance on society. The art of preserving the health is called hygiene; the art of recovering or restoring the health when lost or enfeebled is called medicine. Now, it being self-evident that health is a desirable, and disease a highly obnoxious, state of life, it naturally follows that the study both of hygiene and medicine are of the greatest importance, and should be as widely disseminated as possible; yet, by one of the strange and apparently inexplicable contradictions of our nature, mankind seem to have agreed, by a species of tacit understanding, to neglect or ignore altogether those branches of knowledge that concern them most. Thus, while we see theological lore of the most abstruse and controversial kind eagerly sought after among all classes of society; while no man with any pretence to education would like to be deemed ignorant of the laws, at least, of his own country; while the physical sciences successfully assert their claim to rank as regular branches of popular education, and terms of scientific erudition are growing familiar in mechanics' institutes and young men's societies; while even that slow-going gentleman the British agriculturist begins to smell ammonia, and to conceive some faint thread of a notion that chemistry may be, after all, a good thing for a farmer to know; the study of the laws of health and disease is almost entirely neglected. Thus far I agree with M. Raspail. I cannot, however, go with him quite to the extent of declaring that the practice of medicine is abandoned to a small knot of men, by whom this most noble of arts is degraded to the level of an ordinary trade, carried on mostly with a degree of ignorance and presumption that would ruin the greatest botcher in the cobbling line. There are too many illustrious names and established reputations among the physicians of England and France to warrant his sweeping assertion: yet M. Raspail might have strengthened his argument had he been familiar with the existence in England—a flagrant, shameless, unchecked existence, happily unknown in France—of the gentry who foist their cartloads of vile and noxious drugs, in the shape of pills and ointments, upon an ignorant and credulous multitude—the quacks whose puffing advertisements are a scandal to our press, and whose colossal fortunes are a disgrace to our civilization.

According to Raspail, the art of medicine has, for more than two thousand years past, made no real progress; and one of the latest inventions of the medical mind, homœopathy, affords a conviucing proof that medicine has come back to the exact point from which it started, namely, to the simple dietetics of the ancient physicians. But, the homœopathists have ventured (according to him) to erect, on the simple and rational basis of a proper regimen as the most natural method of curing diseases, a dangerous superstructure of infinjtesimals, and monstrous assertions of the curative power of the "high dynamisation" of medical substances. Yet homœopathy is surely vastly preferable to the Sangrado system, to the starving system (I was under a starving doctor once, when I was too young to rebel, and if ever I come across him again, there shall be wailing in the Royal College of Surgeons, or I will know the reason why), to the salivating system, and to that most abominable form of empiricism—experimenting on the unfortunate victims of dire diseases with deadly poisons, such as arsenic, strychnine, prussic acid, bruce, veratrine, hyoscyamus, atropine, opium, belladonna, digitalis, henbane, stramony or thorn-apple, nux vomica, and other members of the distinguished family of poisons, vegetable and mineral. And especially is Raspail wroth with "experimentalists"—"eminent practitioners" who really do what the poor relatives of hospital patients suspect them of doing: such men as Bosquillon, physician of the Hôtel Dieu, who coolly proceeded one morning, by way of experiment, to bleed all the patients on the right, and to purge all those on the left, side of his ward; or as Magendie, who killed, at one fell swoop, seven epileptic patients, "just to see how they would feel after a dose of prussic acid."

Illness, according to M. Raspail, is not a mystery of nature; it is not the result of some occult influence—some mysterious cause that eludes the grasp of our senses. An organ can be affected by illness, or, in other words, suspend or cease its functions, only from a want of its proper nutriment, or from some external cause. The causes of disease are therefore external: illness, in the first instance, attacks us from without, and does not emanate from ourselves. To say that such and such a disease is caused by the blood, the bile, the nerves, or the peccant humours, is simply to give utterance to one of those unmeaning phrases that mostly constitute the professional jargon of the schools, and are of the same family as that celebrated one—"Nature abhors a vacuum." These are bold words, François Vincent Raspail. You would tremble, I think, at your own boldness if you knew how many fashionable physicians there are here in England, whose fame, whose harvests of guineas, whose patents of baronetcy, are due to that one talismanic word "nerves." How many practitioners have gained a reputation for vast and almost boundless learning and wisdom by merely putting their thumbs in their waistcoat-pockets, with the head a little on one side, enunciating, solemnly, "Stomach!" To ascertain what the external causes really are that affect our organs, we must have recourse to analogy, for in most cases they escape the scrutiny of our senses. When a point, or sting, or simple thorn, pierces your flesh, or gets into your skin, your sufferings may become excruciating. Why? Because the thorn has violently torn the superficial expansions of the subdivisions of the nerves, and has opened to the external air free access to the tissues protected before by the epidermis. You know the illness in this case to be caused by the thorn or prickle, and would not dream of ascribing it to the blood, the bile, or the nerves. But, let us suppose that, from some circumstance, the sting or prickle escapes our sight, and finds its way into the substance of the stomach or of the lungs: the presence of foreign bodies in either of these organs so essential to life will necessarily give rise to much more serious symptoms. Now, here the material cause of the evil not having been revealed to the senses, medicine will step in with a whole train of conjecture. One physician will ascribe the illness to the bile, another to the blood, a third to the nerves; and the patient will be called upon to abdicate his own free-will, and the use of his reasoning faculties, and to submit blindly to a course of treatment as little comprehended by the doctor as by the patient. A careful and minute post-mortem examination would reveal the presence of the little prickle, and show the doctor that the blood, the bile, or the nerves, had been most unjustly accused of having done all the mischief. The similitude of the effects has never, in medicine, served to reveal the similitude of the causes; and, where the cause of a disease has been hidden from observation, no one has ever had recourse to analogy to find it out.

M. Raspail enumerates, among the causes of diseases, the introduction of foreign bodies into the organism; of poisons, or substances which, far from being adapted for assimilation and the development of the organic tissues, combine with them only to disorganize and destroy them. Next, long-continued excesses of cold and heat, or sudden transition from one temperature to another; solutions of continuity of the muscles; hurts and wounds; the introduction into our tissues of graminеals (grasses), dust, and sweeping of granaries, awns, prickles, down of plants or of grains: which, when present in the cavities of our organs, generate or develop themselves there, or swell under the influence of moisture. Again, want or impurity of air; for, the most trifling alteration of the constitution of the atmosphere causes a disturbance of the regular functions of our organs. Pure air is the bread of respiration. Other causes are privation, excess, insufficiency of food, bad quality and adulteration of the alimentary substances. People die of indigestion as well as of starvation; the sufferings in the one case are equal to those in the other; and the indigestion of the rich may be looked upon as a species of set-off to the starvation of the poor. Others, again, are the external and internal parasitism of hydatids, maggots, larvæ of flies or caterpillars, ticks, insects, coleoptera, and especially intestinal worms that seize on the infant in the cradle, and often adhere to man through life, quitting him only in the grave, where they hand him over to other worms. Indeed, M. Raspail ascribes the "parasitism of the infinitely small" as the cause of nine-tenths of our diseases. He finally ranks among aids to it, if not causes of illness, moral maladies—violent impressions, wounded affections, deceived hopes, disappointed ambition, weariness, and despair. Hereditary and constitutional diseases he seems determined to ignore, and is even silent as to the diseases of deformity and defective organization. Their causes are perhaps self-evident.

Now, having told us why we are ill, the author proceeds to tell us how we can keep well. Short and sententious are his hygienic precepts. You are to choose a dwelling exposed to the sun, but sheltered from the noxious emanations of swamps, ditches, and rivers, gasworks and factories. You are not to inhabit the kitchen-floor if you can help it. Let your dwelling-room be high, and look to any point of the compass but the north. (This would not suit artists, to whom a northern aspect is a desideratum.) Don't turn your bedroom into a workroom, library or kitchen. Keep one window at least in it open all day. Do not place anything in it that emits smells, agreeable or otherwise. Banish even flowers; they evolve suffocating gases. The walls should be painted; or papered with a good sound paper, pasted down firmly with size, scented over the fire with black pepper, aloes, or garlic (!), which M. Raspail terms the "camphor of the poor." Have no paintings on the walls, no hangings to the bed. Sleep on a hard mattress. Have no furniture in your bedroom but the bed, a wash-hand stand and two chairs. Very healthy all these arrangements, no doubt, M. Raspail, but exceedingly ugly.

Stop the chinks between badly-joined boards with a paste of flour, pounded pepper, pounded aloes, plaster, and clay. By these means you will avoid draughts, need no vermin annihilator, and be enabled to set rats, mice, bugs, and fleas, at defiance. I have seen a somewhat similar process adopted in the North of England; it is there called pugging. Rats and mice abhor aloes: rat's-bane they don't much care for, especially if they can get a sufficient quantity of water to drink afterwards. Put black pepper in grains, and small lumps of camphor, into the wool of your mattresses. Garnish the beds of infants of tender years with picked leaves of the wood fern. (How far a border of the ferns of Great Britain, nature printed of course, would be advantageous in garnishing a baby's crib I am rather at a loss to know.) As an infant of tender years, I remember, myself, having had my bed garnished sometimes with the crumbs of French rolls, occasionally with the bristles of a hair-brush, cut up small, and on one occasion with a poker and a pair of tongs; but, beyond producing a sensible irritation or urtication of the epidermis I am not prepared to state what sanitary benefits I derived therefrom. M. Raspail can at least quote tradition in support of his leafy system of garnishing—for did not the robin red-breasts cover the little children in the wood with leaves, and were not those infants of tender years?

Wash your bedsteads frequently with camphorated brandy. Keep chloride of lime constantly at hand. Have a fire in your bed-room from time to time, and burn some vinegar on a red-hot iron plate. Have your bed well-aired every day. Change your body linen night and morning. Take a bath as often as ever you can. Never scour a floor; wax and dry-rub it. Let your clothes be made wide and easy. Gentlemen, leave off chimney-pot hats and all-round collars. The first press on the brow and chill the brain: the second impede the respiration. Ladies, don't wear stays. Nurses and mothers, never swaddle your babies. Tightness of dress is torture to an infant. When the weather is warm let your children roll and kick about naked in the open air: it will make them healthy and strong.

Now hear M. Raspail upon culinary hygienics. Good cheer, he says, is one of the chief preservatives of health. Keep regular hours for your meals. Eat and drink in moderation; vary your dishes. Never force yourself to eat if you have no appetite. Rest yourself half an hour after each meal: then take some bodily exercise. Never use any other water for your drink or for culinary purposes, than spring water and well-filtered river water. There are many diseases that arise entirely from the use of unwholesome water. Many epidemics might be traced to the abominable compound of dirt and putridity which the water-companies are permitted to palm on us. Never drink water out of a ditch or a pool, if you can possibly help it. You may swallow unwittingly small leeches even. If you happen to live in a country where goitre prevails endemically (which is caused by the use of water that has filtered through mercurial veins), put granulated tin into your cisterns and drinking vessels. The best bread for a hard-working man is made of a mixture of rye, barley, and wheat: fine wheaten bread is more adapted for men of sedentary occupations. A good savoury potage (the French pot-au-feu, for which see Soyer), is one of the most nutritive and wholesome dishes, particularly for a weak stomach.

Hear Raspail on pickles, sauces, and condiments. If you can afford it, have always on your table by way of side-dishes, hams, sausages, anchovies, capers, green or black olives, marinades (pickled fish), tomato jelly, radishes, spiced mustard: in short, the best condiments you can afford; so that there may be a choice for various appetites. Do not listen to the tirades of the partisans of physiological doctrines, who, from an idle fear of increasing the gastric affections under which they labour, dread and and eschew the very things that would cure them. Season your stews and ragouts with bay-leaves, thyme, tarragon, garlic, pepper, pimento, or cloves, according to circumstances. Drink water when you can procure it good, but take also a little wine for your stomach's sake. The addition of a reasonable quantity of alcoholic liquor tends to accelerate a sluggish digestion, by supplying the excess of gluten with an amount of alcohol that the natural process could n't produce under the circumstances. Hence the necessity for good wine, beer, and other alcoholic beverages for northern constitutions. Flavour your cream or milk dishes with vanille, orange flowers, or cinnamon. Roast your joints, always before an open fire: never have them baked. Legs and shoulders of mutton should be stuffed with garlic. A good salad is the most agreeable condiment, and the best promoter of a digestion fatigued by a long dinner. Wild and bitter endive make an excellent and wholesome salad. Put in plenty of oil, and (if your senses can bear it) rub the bowl with garlic.

M. Raspail, as I have before hinted, eschews teetotalism; but he inculcates and strongly recommends temperance—as what sane man does not? He advises those who are blessed with the goods of this world to prefer the light French wines (the so-called vins-ordinaires) to the fine sorts, and either to the heavy Spanish and Portuguese wines—many of which (particularly the abominations compounded of bad brandy, geropigo, and the refuse of grape-skins, and sold dirt cheap under the names of port and sherry) are downright poisons, and will ruin the strongest constitutions. If you can't get good and pure wine abstain from it altogether: so with beer. As to the more potent alcohols, brandy, rum, gin, whiskey, arrack, their comparative purity may be tested simply enough: pour a few drops on your hands and rub them together briskly. Apply your nose to the palms, and the smell will at once tell you whether you have a pure article or a Fousel Oil counterfeit: the Fousil Oil, which immediately betrays its presence by its repulsive smell, is a poison that you cannot too carefully avoid. Enjoy all the Creator's gifts cheerfully, but in moderation; and be not deceived when you see a gray-haired glutton or a drunkard of fourscore, and say to yourself "O, I can feast, I can carouse without stint. Here is a hog that has grunted in Epicurus' stye for eighty years." Remember: That a drunkard who hath taken no hurt by his drink is no more a proof of the innocuousness of drunkenness, than a soldier who hath been to the wars and hath never been wounded, is of the absence of danger in a battle.

A few more words on hygiène. Wear strong and solid boots in Winter. Instead of an umbrella, which affords no real protection against the rain, carry a hooded cloak, made of light impermeable gauze, which, folded up, may fit into your waistcoat pocket. Ladies, instead of encumbering yourselves with a parasol, wear a light broad-brimmed straw hat. Eschew and denounce the use of spun-glass tissues and brocades, which, unhappily, are again coming into fashion. They are confusion. Their use was very properly abandoned during the eighteenth century, because it was found that the pulverulent particles of spun glass affected the lungs most seriously, and often even fatally. I can corroborate this statement of M. Raspail from a fact within my own knowledge. Some years ago the Mistress of the Robes of one of the principal metropolitan theatres, told me that an accomplished actress insisted upon wearing a dress of some newly-introduced spun-glass tissue of brocade in a Christmas piece. The dress was made in the wardrobe of the theatre; and, shortly afterwards, half the workwomen who were employed upon it were laid up with sore fingers, whitlows, and severe coughs. Workmen employed in the preparation of colours or other substances into the composition of which mineral colours enter, wash your heads and hands, first in lye-water, afterwards in soap-water, when leaving work, at meal times or at night. Bird stuffers, never use arsenical or mercurial preparations to protect the skins you stuff against the voracity of insects. It is fraught with the most pernicious and fatal consequences to yourselves and to the collectors and curators of museums of natural history. The desired object may be obtained as fully, and in a perfectly safe manner, by impregnating the internal surface of the skins with a solution of aloes and pepper, to be afterwards sprinkled with powdered camphor. House-painters, discontinue the use of the arsenical compound, known as Scheele's green: it is confusion. Substitute for it a green composed of iron and copper, which is cheaper, sanitary, and as beautiful in colour. Housekeepers, have all your copper vessels tinned on the inside. Make all your pickles and preserves at home. Never boil halfpence with your Brussels sprouts to green them. It is destruction. Let your spoons and forks be of silver, of tin, or of tinned iron, but on no account of German silver, or of any other of the multi-named compositions pretending to imitate, or to be substitutes for, gold and silver. The art of preparing a substance that shall in every way replace gold and silver, remains as yet to be discovered. Keep your kitchens and dining-rooms scrupulously clean. A clean kitchen is, nine and three-quarter cases out of ten, the criterion of a clean housewife and a happy household. Governors, prohibit the sale of arsenic absolutely: the prohibition ought also to extend to rat's-bane. Subject physicians' prescriptions of a dangerous nature to the control of a sanitary board; and make the apothecary who shall dispense a dangerous preparation, equally responsible for the consequences with the physician who has prescribed it. For, M. Raspail maintains that the materia medica of the old school contains not one agent of a deleterious or dangerous nature, of which the therapeutic effects may not be as fully and effectually produced by an innocuous substance. Tramps, gipsies, you that sleep in the open air, on the ground, in trees or haystacks, stuff your ears with cotton, or tie a bandage round your head. Otherwise you will have ear-ache and affections caused by the introduction of seeds, beards of grass, &c., into the auditory tube, the nasal chamber, or windpipe. Mothers, feed not your children upon sweets, biscuits, or mucilages. They feed not them, but ascarides, parasites instead. Give them rather, sound condiments and wholesome pickles. Wise men and women, all look early upon life as a duty, upon death as an accident or a necessity. Guard against the suggestions of hatred and the aberrations of love. Avoid enervating pursuits and expensive pleasures. Rise in the morning as soon as you wake; go to bed at night as soon as you feel that it requires a strong effort of volition to keep your eyes open. Be angry as seldom as ever you can. Never go to law. Be economical, never avaricious. Work, wash, and pray. So shall you live to a good old age, and your death, at last, be but an extinction of vitality, without pain or suffering. Nay, the length of human life might equal the fabulous longevity of the inhabitants of the sea, if we had in every season a constant and invariable temperature around us. But we have not.

A RUSSIAN NOVELIST.

[From Chambers's Journal.]

THERE seems to be a very general impression in this country, that the literature of Russia is little worth. Our German neighbours, however, know better, and possess in their language spirited versions of the works of many Russian writers, whose very names are unknown amongst us. One modern author, Rukolnik, excels in the delineation of Russian everyday-life and manners. The greater number of his tales are historical; and while there is nothing very new or striking in their plots or incidents, there is a naive and quiet humour, a power of individualising character, and giving life-like reality to imaginary scenes, that almost entitle the writer to rank with the best French and English *littérateurs* of the day.

From one of his tales, *The New Year*, we translate a few scenes, using the excellent German version of Herr Lewald. The scene is laid in the reign of Peter the Great, just after he had abolished the troublesome corps of the Strelitzes, and was about to change the calendar—the year, until his time, being always reckoned to commence in September. The story begins by describing the Czar Peter choosing a common soldier, Alexander Iwanowitsch, to be his personal attendant.

Heavy duties awaited Alexander—from morning till evening to attend on the czar, with scarcely any interval; at night to watch and be ready to present the tablet and pencil whenever any new idea occurred to his majesty; in the morning, he had to go into the office, look after and detect the tricks of the officials, and bring such a report to Peter as might enable him to decide on all matters of business; for in Russia the czar is a god upon earth, and creates men a second time, according to his pleasure. Alexander Danilitsch Menschikoff was a simple soldier, when the czar, for his intellect and punctuality, raised him to the rank of a noble. Sometimes, when the czar met a commonplace-looking German, he looked into his soul, and decided that he would make a valiant woiwode. Did the appearance of a clerk in a shop happen to please him—"I know him, I know him!" said the czar; "he will make a skilful ambassador." It was a monarch's business, he used to say, to study men, and select such from every rank as might best serve the state.

"Go, Alexander Iwanowitsch," he would say—"such a bojar thinks too much of himself. Go, tell him the truth; and, if necessary, shave off his beard. Here's a German ambassador coming—go, Alexander, and see that a room be washed out for his reception; that the curtains be hung, the carpet spread; a cask of mead, one of beer, and a small one of Rhenish wine be placed for him in the cellar. Look after it all with thine own eyes. Why art thou sitting there idle? Thou hast glue, paper and gunpowder—make fire-wheels and rockets. The new year will soon be here: September is nearly come; we shall want plenty of these things for rejoicing." And so it went on. Alexander rose higher daily in Peter's good graces; yet the poor fellow still remained only a deutschik.*

The storms which, morally speaking, had purified the atmosphere of Russia, were over. Ukase after ukase, directed to every corner of the vast and various empire, had at length the effect of concentrating its scattered forces, and reviving its sinking vitality. Only to God in heaven, and to one man upon earth, was it known what would become of the fifth division of the world.† In everything was there tumult and disquietude. Even those who stood nearest to the throne, often shook their heads as they read the frequent ukases issued by the czar respecting recruiting, stamps, the regulation of the beard, of travelling, &c. Alexander Iwanowitsch, however, did not think himself entitled to shake his head at anything bearing the signature of the mighty reformer; and he often said to the others: "Don't trouble your heads to criticise the orders you receive, but do your best to obey them."

The 1st of September, the first day of the new year, came. The czar went in the morning to Moscow; Alexander followed him, dressed in new regimentals, which he had dusted well with the czar's brush. Crowds of people stood in the streets, awaiting Peter's arrival; deep anxiety and dejection were visible on their countenances. Thousands of those connected with the Strelitzes had been brought to the block, and thousands more lay in prison. Another and scarcely less important cause of discontent amongst the ignorant populace, was the war waged by the czar against the beards, and the ancient fashion of clothing. Some held their beards fast, as if they feared that some court emissary might come up secretly and rob them of their treasure. The usual attribute of New Year's Day, the double throne for the czar and the patriarch, was not to be seen in the market-place. Fear and astonishment seemed to have possessed the people. At length, the bells began to ring, and the crowd bowed their uncovered heads to the earth. The czar approached on foot, leading his six-years' old son by the hand. After him came the czarina, Ewdokia Feodorowna, in half-European, half-Asiatic costume. She was followed by her ladies in European dress, and without veils. Then came the bojar Seleeni, and the principal civil and military officers. One loud hurra hailed the czar; but when the innovation of ladies without veils and officials without beards appeared, the shout of joy was changed into a deep groan. In many parts of the crowd was heard loud and bitter weeping.

"Ah, my Heaven!" sobbed an old woman, "how they have plucked our poor bojars, as if they were Germans!" Peter turned towards a group of soldiers and nodded to them.

"A happy New Year, comrades!" said he. But the czarina, and the other ladies of the royal family, the aunts and sisters of the czar, turned away their heads, and looked haughtily towards the other side. The fair maidens who followed, made amends for the absence of veils by casting down their eyes; yet the bright glow of the surrounding red uniforms, then worn by the poteschni, seemed to exercise a magnetic attraction on these same sparkling eyes, which, under cover of their long lashes, stole furtive glances as they passed, to be repaid by looks of undisguised admiration from the young officers on duty.

"I know them all," said a soldier of the preobraschenski, Prince Lukka. His comrades looked at him with envy, but Alexander Iwanowitsch with somewhat of doubt.

"Oh, I think Alexander must have already danced with them all," said a soldier of the same regiment laughingly.

"Am I then a dancer?" said Iwanowitsch. "The czar has many servants fit for that, and he clothes them in shoes and stockings; but we deutschiks go in boots, and have to stand in corners while the others are dancing. All we can do, is to look, and that does not do us much good. Ah, what beautiful maidens! I only pray I may not dream that I am going to be married to one of them."*

The procession was over, the crowds began to disperse; and when the czar returned, he did not find Alexander at his usual post in the antechamber. Peter ascended to his deutschik's room, and paused at the half-open door to listen. Its tenant, believing himself in perfect solitude, was busily employed in practising a minuet. "One, two, three—a bow! One, two, three, one, two, three—a bow!"

At the second bow, he came right against the door, where the czar was standing, laughing heartily. He was so taken by surprise, that he remained for some moments in the same position, without standing up.

"What's all this, Alexander? Who was your instructor?"

"Thy court-fool."

"Which of them?"

"Hermann."

"Ah, he's a great rascal; that is not the way to dance."

And the czar shewed him how a minuet should be danced; but Alexander had practised the wrong way so thoroughly, that he could not now readily adopt the right. Discouraged at length, he walked towards the window, and refused to dance any more.

"What! art thou already weary?"

"No, czar, but I don't care to dance any more. I don't understand it, and it does not signify. What a figure I should cut at the ball! It will be much better for me not to think of dancing."

"Don't lose courage. With such a head as thine"——

"Ah! but that's the misfortune—that the feet are not the head. And, after all, 'tis a pity; for I wanted to teach this new dance to all my friends at the ball, before thy entrance."

"Come, then, try again. One, two, three—bow! One, two, three—bow!" Suddenly Iwanowitsch seized the measure of the minuet, and did the step correctly.

"Thanks, czar," said he; "now I understand it. But don't punish the court-fool. What is his business but to make fools of other people?"

"Now," said Peter, "I am going to take a drive in my new one-horse car. I want to change the travelling fashion of my bojars. At present, not one of them will travel from his country-seat to Moscow without turning out seven or eight kibitkas and covered wagons, together with a family-coach like a dwelling-house. Now, I'll shew them a new example." So the czar and Alexander set off to drive through the streets of Moscow in a one-horse vehicle of the simplest construction, and without an ornament of any kind.

The people were astonished, the bojars murmured, especially when the czar stopped to ask them how they liked his equipage, and advised each of them to bespeak such another. There was no occasion, he said, for any man to keep useless servants and useless horses. In returning, the czar drove through the Pokrowka quarter.

"Here is the dwelling of Andrea Artomonowitsch," said Peter, as they passed by a tall stone-house. "He is one of the best of the bojars, and what a daughter he has! Alexander, hast thou ever seen Maria Andreewna?"

"Not quite," answered the deutschik, blushing to the tips of his ears.

The czar looked at him fixedly. "What means 'not quite?' and why dost thou turn so red?"

"The redness, czar, comes from the weather, and the 'not quite' means that I saw only her side-face. She was in the procession"——

"And so the redness comes from the weather?" asked the czar. Alexander Iwanowitsch was silent.

"I don't allow this, Alexander. When thou art asked a question, be so good as to give a direct answer, that one may understand thee clearly."

"I can't answer that."

"Why not?"

"Because thou wouldst laugh."

"I will not."

"On thy word of honour?"

"Yes."

"Even the side-face of Maria Andreewna is handsome."

"Now I have thee!" answered the czar. "Listen! Danilitsch Menschikoff began one time to tell me lies; I cudgelled him, and to some purpose. Whoever lies, even in jest, not out of diplomatic necessity, but from inclination, is a bad servant. And if I love a man, I cudgel lying well out of him; he'll thank me for it afterwards. Now, Alexander, take heed to thyself!"

"Another time, czar, I'll take better care."

Time passed on. On the 6th of December, the czar again invited Alexander Iwanowitsch to drive with him, and the coachman was ordered to stop at the house of Andrea Artomonowitsch.

"Is the bojar at home?" inquired the czar of ten servants, dressed after the German fashion, who hastened down the steps.

"He is gone to church, but the young lady is at home."

"Come Alexander!"

They entered the gorgeously furnished guest-chamber. The czar's face darkened as Maria Andreewna, accompanied by her governess, entered the room.

"Good-morning, Mascha," he said, as he took hold of the girl's long hair and kissed her on the forehead. "What brings this old hag after thee?"

"My father's command."

"I suppose 'tis not thine own choice?"

"My father's will is always my choice."

"Good daughter! That pleases me; for rebellion against thy father would be the same as rebellion against the czar. Now tell me, does this youth please thee?" added he, drawing Alexander forward, who was bashfully standing near the door.

Maria blushed, and tried to run behind her governess; but the czar held her fast by the hands.

"Leave off this nonsense, Maschinka," he said. "What hast thou to be ashamed of? Thou must tell the truth to the czar, as thou wouldst to thy father."

"I don't know," replied Maria with a trembling voice and downcast eyes.

"Well, if thou dost not know, look at him."

And Peter tried to lead her towards Alexander; but the shy deutschik retreated towards the door, just as it opened, and Andrea Artomonowitsch pushed against his back.

"Where art thou going, Alexander Iwanowitsch?" exclaimed he in surprise.

"He's running away from thy daughter," said the czar; "but thou and I, Artomonowitsch, will soon teach him better."

"Yes, yes, we'll soon teach him," answered the okolnitschi, chiming in with his master.

"And no need either to defer the lesson. See, thou hast a handsome piece of merchandise, and I a handsome purchaser. Let us agree: I'll make the match."

Now it was Andrea's turn to step backwards. Maria ran to her governess, and concealed her glowing face behind the old woman. Alexander Iwanowitsch cast a woful glance at the czar, as if he meant to reproach him for jesting at his expense. Peter approached the okolnitschi.

"Now," said he kindly, "is it not true, Artomonowitsch, that I have found a handsome bridegroom for thy Maschinka?"

"Great is thy royal goodness!" answered Andrea, trembling and bowing. "Only permit, great and mighty czar—only do not be angry if I make one request to thee, my lord and benefactor, that—how shall I say it?—thy majesty should choose a member of some old bojar family, and not this simple deutschik, whose descent who knows?" And he fell on his knees before the czar.

Peter's eyes glowed with anger, but after a few moments he said, quickly yet calmly: "Stand up! Thy posture suits badly with thy pride of heart. Stand up, and declare who made thee okolnitschi! The czar, Alexis Michaelowitsch of blessed memory, made thee his chamberlain, half for thy father's sake, who had been raised from an obscure condition by his predecessor. So don't pride thyself on thy descent, Artomonowitsch, but just say that thou wilt or wilt not."

"Father," whispered Maria, throwing her arms round his neck, "don't make the czar angry!"

"Go to thy chamber!" was the fierce reply. Maria lingered; but the czar took her by the hand, and said:

"Go, Maschinka; God is gracious. I'll manage the matter, and do thou obey thy father." Maria retired sadly, followed by her governess.

"Come, Artomonowitsch," said the czar: "time presses. Decide—how is it to be?"

"Let it be as thou wilt, only my Maschinka, is too young—only nineteen. Permit us, czar, to wait a little. Let the marriage be deferred until next year."

"Agreed," said Peter. "In the second week after New Year's Day, the wedding shall take place. Dost thou consent?"

"I thank thee, czar, for thy kindness."

"Now, then, see that thou keepest thy word! And on New Year's Day we will have the betrothal."

"I can only thank thee."

"Now, then, kiss the bridegroom. So, all right. Now, embrace the match-maker. Farewell, Artomonowitsch; I thank the for thy good decision."

No sooner had the czar and Alexander taken their departure, than the okolnitschi called his daughter and her duenna to account.

"What hast thou been about, old night-owl!" he said to the latter, "that thou must bring her down to receive men? A pretty mess thou hast got us into with this confounded deutschik. Nothing, forsooth, will do for him but to espouse the descendant of a bojar! And my young lady must follow the new fashions, and be treated all at once like a grown-up woman. Well, we'll see yet if we can't prevent it. A great deal of water runs by in a year! Now, mark me, girl—not a step shalt thou stir ont of thine own apartments. And thou, old night-owl, take not thine eyes off her! If she catches another glimpse of the deutschik, even through a chink of a door, I'll pack thee out of the world! Is it for nothing that I am her father? Give her to a nameless deutschik, indeed! Wait until spring!"

The okolnitschi went into his room, and sat down to write a letter. As soon as he had finished it, he called one of his grooms, gave him five rubles, ordered him to take the three best horses from the stable, and to hasten to Woronesch with the letter, directed to Prince Lukka; and as soon as he obtained an answer, to return without delay. "Drink no brandy by the way," he added, "but refresh thyself with beer; and now, go on thy way in God's name!"

"Alexander," said the czar some days afterwards, "hast thou lately visited thy bride?"

"What's the use of my going to the house?" said the deutschik: "the okolnitschi will never allow his daughter to be seen. He says it is not the custom."

"Does he so?" said Peter. "Have patience!"

On the 15th of December, there was scarcely standing-room to be found in any church in Moscow. After prayers, a new ukase was to be read. It was first proclaimed in the Red Market-place with the sound of trumpets, and from the town-hall it was issued in printed sheets. The whole city was in a state of commotion: people could not believe either their eyes or ears. Every man in authority was surrounded by persons seeking information, and the whole crowd thus became divided into groups. The court outside the house of the okolnitschi, Andrea Artomonowitsch, was filled with persons of various ranks. He had been taking a nap after a hearty breakfast, and was suddenly awakened by the noise. Looking out of the window, he asked a respectable shopkeeper, Zachoica Petroff, what was the matter. The latter, proud of being addressed, cleared his throat, and approached the window. "I have the honour to announce to your Grace," said he, "that eight months have been taken from us by the czar—that is to say, that four months have, as it were, been thrown out of the window. We cannot reckon ourselves either in the new or in the old year; and it is generally said that we are to step over into the next century. The old reckoning is declared to be wrong, so that not one of us will be able to tell how old he is, or when he was born; and these four months are, so to speak, a sort of superfluity that we can do what we wish with."

"What stuff!" cried the bojar. "Some one has been making fools of the whole set of you!"

"No, bojar; it is a ukase: be so good as to read it. There it is." And a copy of the proclamation flew into the room through the open window. The okolnitschi took it, and read as folows:

"In the year of the world seven thousand eight hundred and twenty, on the fifteenth of December, has the mighty lord and prince the czar, Peter Alexiewitsch, ruler of Great, Little and White Russia, ordained as follows: It is well known that not only amongst European nations, but also amongst several Slavonic tribes who acknowledge the authority of our orthodox church, the year is reckoned to commence eight days after the birth of Christ—that is, on the first day of January, and not, as we at present reckon it, from the creation.

"And whereas now from the birth of Our Lord the year 1699 is just about to end, and from the first of next January, 1700, a new century will commence, it is ordered that in all offices, and in the transaction of both public and private business, the above date be employed, and the coming year be styled A.D. 1700." Then followed specific directions as to the nature and extent of the public rejoicing appointed to celebrate this event.

Having deliberately finished the